

CULTURE, ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, HISTORY, BELIEF SYSTEMS,  
POLITICAL CONCEPTS OF EVOLUTION, INTEREST GROUPS AND  
LEADERSHIP, AS PRAGMATIC AS AUTONOMOUS; INDEPENDENT OF MIND  
AND BY SELF DIRECTED POLITICAL DECISION-MAKERS THROUGH  
EVOLUTION FROM OUR FOUNDING FATHERS TO A CHARISMATIC RONALD  
REAGAN AND HIS GOVERNMENT; THE POLITICAL MACHINE AND ITS  
INFLUENTIAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE ROLE OF PRESIDENT RONALD  
REAGAN THAT RESULTED IN A “REAGANOMIC” SOLUTION IN AMERICAN  
POLITICS

A RESEARCH PAPER

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENTS OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF ARTS –POLITICAL SCIENCE

BY

MARTINA L. TEAGUE, MILLER

DR. JOHN ROUSE

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, INDIANA

MAY 2012

## **I. Introduction:**

### A. Purpose of Paper

#### 1. Statement of Purpose

### B. Organizational Structure

#### 1. Definition of Organizational Structure

- i. Autonomy, Politics, Causation and Empowerment
- ii. Patriotism an American Culture

#### 2. City of Anderson, Mayor Kris Ockomon's political perspective

- i. Mayor Ockomon and Autonomous decision-making affirmed
- ii. The First and Second Continental Congress, and Independence
- iii. Congress and the Declaration of Independence

### C. The Occupation of President Ronald Reagan

#### 1. From Hollywood Actor to President of the United States

- i. Reagan and the Cinema
- ii. Democrat, Republican and Liberal preferences by association
- iii. The Financial Support (Backing) of the Reagan Campaign
- iv. From President Jimmy Carter to Reagan

### D. Belief Systems

#### 1. Chris Trueman's interpretations of the United States Constitution

- i. Democracy
- ii. Sovereignty
- iii. Public Policy

### E. Political Concepts of Evolution

#### 1. Political Evolution Beliefs by Political Moguls

#### 2. Political Evolution; Development, Growth, Progress and Achievement

- i. America's Constitutional Enterprise
- ii. Government
- iii. Levels of Power
- iv. Centralized and Decentralized Government

### G. Interest Groups

#### 1. Political Parties (socials)

- i. Partisan
- ii. Bi-Partisan

## H. Leadership

1. A Republican Government led by Ronald Reagan (1981 - 1989)
  - i. Deprivation of the Lowly
  - ii. Middle Class Elimination
  - iii. Absolute Reaganomics

## II. Literature Review:

Borgatti, Stephen P. (1996). Copyright ©1996 *Organizational Theory: The Determinants of Structure*. Retrieved on January 3, 2011 from <http://www.analytictech.com/mb021/orgtheory.htm>

Bowman, M. Robert, Dr. & Lt. Col. *USAF, TAX REFORM AND CLASS WARFARE* Retrieved on February 13 2011 from <http://www.rmbowman.com/ssn/taxes.htm>

Brydon, Diana. (2010). University of Western Ontario. *Post-colonialism Now: Autonomy, Cosmopolitanism, and Diaspora*. Retrieved on Jan 6, 2011 from [http://www.globalautonomy.ca/global1/article.jsp?index=RA\\_Brydon\\_Postcolonialism.x](http://www.globalautonomy.ca/global1/article.jsp?index=RA_Brydon_Postcolonialism.x)

Castoriadis, Cornelius. (1997). *Phusis and autonomy the World in fragments: Writings on politics, society, psychoanalysis and the imagination*. Trans. & ed. David Ames Curtis, 331-41. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Constitution Society. (2010). *Summary of Constitutional Rights, Powers and Duties* Retrieved on May12, 2011 from <http://www.constitution.org/powright.htm>

Dauve, Gilles. (2008). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Autonomy*. Retrieved on Jan 4, 2011 from <http://libcom.org/library/a-contribution-critique-political-autonomy-gilles-dauve-2008>

Dreier, Peter. (2004). *Reagan's Legacy: Homelessness in America*. National Housing Institute (NHI), Issue #135, May/June 2004. Retrieved on February 14, 2012 from <http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/135/reagan.html>

Ellis, Christopher & Faricy, Christopher. (2011). *Social Policy and Public Opinion: How the Ideological Direction of Spending Influences Public Mood*. Journal of Politics; Oct2011, Vol. 73 Issue 4, p1095-1110, 16p Retrieved on February 20, 2012 from <http://cms.bsu.edu/Academics/Libraries.aspx>

Encyclopedia Britannica. (2010). Retrieved on Jan 3, 2011 <http://www.britannica.com/>

Glencoe/McGraw Hill. (2002-2003). *National Government: US Government-Democracy in Action by United States*. Retrieved on May12, 2011 from <http://www.glencoe.com/sec/socialstudies/govciv/usgov2002/index.php>

Gregory, Anthony. (2006). *Waco and the Bipartisan Police State*. Retrieved on September 26, 2010 from <http://www.lewrockwell.com/gregory/gregory117.html>

Graber, Robert Bates. (1995). *A Scientific Model of Social and Cultural Evolution*. Kirksville, Missouri: Thomas Jefferson University Press. Retrieved on July 15, 2011 from <http://www2.truman.edu/~rgraber/cultev/polevo.html>

Harsin, Jayson. (2010). *The Lost Histories of American Economic Rights*. Retrieved on July 12, 2011. From Ball State University Library @ <http://cms.bsu.edu/Academics/Libraries.aspx>

Held, David. (1995). *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Retrieved on May15, 2011 from [http://www.princeton.edu/wwac/academic-review/files/561/9.4\\_Held.doc](http://www.princeton.edu/wwac/academic-review/files/561/9.4_Held.doc)

Lakoff, George. (2009). *Moral Politics How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Retrieved on Jan 7, 2010 from <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/467716.html>

Lane, Roger. (Collins, Benjamin R.). (1992). *Urban Police and Crime in the Nineteenth-Century America*. Crime and Justice © 1992 The University of Chicago Press Retrieved on August 2011 from <http://www.jstor.org/pss/1147616>

Merriam Webster. (2011). Retrieved on January 3 2011 from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>

Niskanen, William A. (1988). *Reagonomics*. The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. The Library of Economics and Liberty. Retrieved on February 13 2011 from <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc1/Reagonomics.html>

Ockomon, Kris. (2011). Mayor of Anderson, Indiana. *A Personal Interview*. Retrieved on February 12, 2011

Ollman Bertell. (2012). *What Role Does Patriotism Play in Capitalist Democracy: Particularly Ours / Particularly Now?* The International Endowment for Democracy Retrieved March 13, 2012 from [http://www.iefd.org/articles/Patriotism\\_in\\_capitalist\\_democracy.php](http://www.iefd.org/articles/Patriotism_in_capitalist_democracy.php)

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. (2009) 5<sup>th</sup>. Edition Retrieved on August 17, 2011 from <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/databases/index.php?tab=subject&subject=9> (&) <http://cms.bsu.edu/Academics/Libraries.aspx>

Rouse, John PhD. (2004). “*WHAT IS CHARISMA?*” Retrieved on July 4, 2011 from <http://english.pravda.ru/opinion/feedback/11-06-2004/5859-johnrouse-0/11.06.2004> by Pravada

Potluck, SSA. (2007). *Cuts To Social Security-It's Been Done Before*. Retrieved February 6, 2011 from <http://socialsecuritypotluckdotcom.wordpress.com/2011/02/07/cuts-to-social-security-its-been-done-before/>

Sartre, John Paul. (2005). *Inherent Autonomy The Meaning of Independence Day* Retrieved on July 4, 2011 from <http://batr.org/autonomy/070405.html>

Simkin, John. (1997). Spartacus Educational.Com. *Ronald Reagan Biography*. Retrieved on Jan 10, 2012 <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USAreagan.htm>

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2010). *Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy* first published July 28, 2003; substantive revision on Aug 11, 2009. Retrieved on Jan 4, 2011 from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/autonomy-moral/>

Taratoot Cole D. and Nixon David C. (2011). *With Strings Attached: Statutory Delegations of Authority to the Executive Branch*. Retrieved on July 29, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02395.x/full>

Trueman, Chris. (2000). History Learning Site (2012) Retrieved on February 24, 2012 from <http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk>

U.S. History.Org. Historic Documents (2012). *The United States Constitution*. Retrieved February 4, from <http://www.ushistory.org/documents/constitution.htm>

Verdon, Steve. (2008). *Politics and Evolution*. Retrieved February 21, 2011 [http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/politics\\_and\\_evolution/](http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/politics_and_evolution/)

World Wide. (2010). *Political Parties*. Retrieved on September 22, from <http://www.politicsresources.net/parties.htm>

### **III. Case Study:**

Charismatic President Ronald Reagan, his administration, and the “Reaganomic” solution effect

#### **IV. Findings / Analysis:**

##### **A. Purpose of Paper**

###### **1. Statement of Purpose**

##### **B. Organizational Structure**

###### **1. Definition of Organizational Structure**

- i. Autonomy, Politics, Causation and Empowerment
- ii. Patriotism an American Culture

###### **2. City of Anderson, Mayor Kris Ockomon's political perspective**

- i. Mayor Ockomon and Autonomous decision-making affirmed
- ii. The First and Second Continental Congress, and Independence
- iii. Congress and the Declaration of Independence

##### **C. The Occupation-President Ronald Reagan**

###### **1. From Hollywood Actor to President of the United States**

- i. Reagan and the Cinema
- ii. Democrat, Republican and Liberal preferences by association
- iii. The Financial Support (Backing) of the Reagan Campaign
- iv. From President Jimmy Carter to Reagan

##### **D. Belief Systems**

###### **1. Chris Trueman's interpretations of the United States Constitution**

- i. Democracy
- ii. Sovereignty
- iii. Public Policy

##### **E. Political Concepts of Evolution**

###### **1. Political Evolution Beliefs by Political Moguls**

###### **2. Political Evolution; Development, Growth, Progress and Achievement**

- i. America's Constitutional Enterprise
- ii. Government
- iii. Levels of Power
- iv. Centralized and Decentralized Government

##### **G. Interest Groups**

###### **1. Political Parties**

- i. Partisan
- ii. Bi-Partisan

## H. Leadership

1. A Republican Government led by Ronald Reagan (1981 - 1989)
  - i. Deprivation of the Lowly
  - ii. Middle Class Elimination
  - iii. Absolute Reaganomics

## **V. Conclusion:**

## **VI. References:**

### **1. Introduction**

The focus is autonomy, politics, economical and social welfare, history, belief systems, political concepts of evolution, interest groups, organizational structure, policy making and leadership. The examination of these important topics consider the fact that innate autonomy in the political arena is a tool used in decision making everyday regardless of person, position, or power. Government decisions often involve serious and devastating consequences but in final all solutions good or bad either up or down trickle upon society as a whole, in the hopes of considering future generations. Autonomous decision-making has played a cultural role respectively in all aspects of evolution in American Politics, its behavior and its development. Innate in both you and I, the Reformers and President Ronald Reagan too, we are responsible for our autonomous decisions in return endure the outcome. Reagan made a decision, his solution, 'Reaganomics', and at the expense of a nation. The result spiraled that reflection into the current.

Reagonomics was the trickle down theory and effect, but what in theory trickled down? What was the effect and on whom did it trickle down upon? Let's begin with autonomy shall we? Autonomy is the state of being self-governed, having the right to self govern. It is a moral sense of independence, a self-directing freedom. It can be taught, learned and

(re) developed by individuals of society; All the while being handed down from generation to generation. Autonomy is more than just free will and free choice; but it is a goal of self-determination at will.

In assessing autonomy we will consider, in terms of autonomy, both its independent value versus its opposite (dependent) value of literature to portray proper correlation to most natural decision-making processes, a preconditioned existence in everyday decision-making. Autonomous decision-making affects all citizens including the decision maker and those close to them from generation after generation. It is especially a concern where and when political decisions are made for the welfare of people in society.

If people are given the power to make decisions for themselves, the relationship between autonomy and decision-making can independently offer negative consequences. But the reality is unless you are Robinson Crusoe stranded on an uninhabited island, no individual in the world decides right from wrong. The relationship between both autonomy and decision making in regards to the final result can sometimes cause (offer) negative consequences. The reality is, no individual in the world is identical or autonomously decides the same what is right or what is wrong. But in context individuals are always subject to the influence of others by similar autonomous actions and decisions.

Politics, skills and disciplines, values and beliefs of government is another autonomous guide nurturing and influencing policy. These actions are acted on by policy-making decision makers for who or what they decide upon can be evaluated by the ever-evolving competition between numerous interest groups or individuals pulling for power (authority) and leadership (control). Altogether though these decisions should be made in



good intent (similar) political affairs of the concern of public relations in society for the betterment, and with regards in the best interest of the people, as a whole, as well as the government.

Political life in particular is known for its principle of entrusted political actions of leaders in professionalism. It is the embellished establishment and maintenance of social order as is also the resolution of social disorder. Within these political activities and by their association, it is also widely viewed by many as an association sometimes characterized, depicted and perceived as being ambiguous, corrupt, deceitful offering a misleading illustration of charismatic leadership.

This consequence alone is appealing for political back scratchers to exercise what is better known as 'quid pro quo', a vising image for status, money or job security as a source of charismatic power (gerrymandering). It can be used wisely without obstruction or in a serious unconventional abusive way by autonomous arrogance or ignorance at any moment by any independent decision made serving only a politician's self interest. These political practices often nowadays are being used for social order, to prevent disorder or division? No, it is a political practice where group (social order) and social disorder deem continuations necessary for maintaining social order by division. Still often the question resonates among American's, what ever happened to 'By the people, for the people'.

In this paper incorporating autonomy, politics, the people and the President of the United States, we will examine The Presidency of the United States, by historical and evolutionary influence upon organizational structure and how it has changed the significance of autonomy and its dilemma as is innate of its affects at all levels of

government, a reality. The government must facilitate control while offering greater autonomy to its entity including people of all subordinate levels. Subsequent, it must do so to promote cost containment, efficiency, competence, offering adequate a well-organized service of quality in order to retain or regain respect of the people. While government trust appears to increase autonomy, it ironically augments administration. But, nevertheless, regulation or deregulation creates the emphasis on increased autonomy that accommodates unpleasant instruments that highly augment central control form of government.

Autonomy is commonly perceived as having the complete freedom and capacity to take action. The problem with this interpretation is sometimes the consequences of this enhanced freedom and the capacity to act at will by nature looses the publics grip on power between the different levels of government, and vise-verse for many issues (i.e. national issues such as, social security, taxation, defense, international relations, and trade). The presidency and its now autocratic machine actually control not only the outcome, but also what people believe and actually as a nation we must look at our history and our forefathers mission. By recognizing that by having a government with a moral commitment to an autonomous society, required for a nation to prosper from its own autonomous actions and decisions, this makes a society vulnerable to those who would abuse this power and cause enormous damage to our nations future.

At the different levels of government, a natural relationship was established early on by the creation of the elections they offered a natural relationship, the autonomous succession of being governed by all aspects that if abused lead to arbitrary economic

decisions made by our leaders. This is why some citizens feel distant or wane from involvement in politics, even more distant from the president and federal government. And, the results remain uncertain about decisions made by government. Instead an integration of the specific underlying concepts and philosophies by means of positive policy issues documented by all levels of government throughout its processes simply just being upfront to the public with no false promises (deceit). We need more accountability, accuracy and honesty. This would be in the best interest of all American citizens regardless of their socioeconomic level, at current, for the future and how about government doing it without back waddling with the exception of hindering a nation, its people or the economy.

The research includes a personal interview in general concerning autonomy and early documented history with the former mayor of Anderson, Indiana, Kris Ockomon, as well as academic sources, published literature, and philosophies. It will offer an extensive analysis of some of the different levels of government from the people to the presidents stressing ever-changing factors in the relationships between them. The research also includes a focus on President Ronald Reagan's administration and emphasizing the ever-changing factors in relationship to its context by methods most commonly used in social and life science studies; the content will be merely descriptive and explanatory. Using the latter in accordance by aiding the exploration of causality to the many underlying principles detailed herein by the many consequences of result of the decisions made and governed by the 'Reagonomic effect'.

Exploring the intertwined relationship of autonomy and politics will establish the concept of personal, and societal autonomy. We will explore behaviors and decisions made by the government and the people. This in-depth investigation of autonomy, culture, politics, decision-making, facts, history, independence, individualism, dependency, and or other forms of government may give some insight or cognate awareness, on the behalf of personal (independent) and societal (dependent) autonomous behaviors, in consequence of the many decisions made by not only us, the people, but by the diverse levels of the united states government, the power endowed with enhanced freedoms to decide, and just how these issues impart upon repetitive inclusions and causal principles to make change for the worse or better. And the consequences along this course encompassing the all blend recipe of autonomy, culture, decision-making, facts, history, independence, individualism, dependency, politics, and or other forms of government.

## **II. Literature Review**

### **B. 1. Organizational Structure**

The definition of organizational structures is obviously a primarily hierarchical concept of the subordination amongst entities collaborating and contributing to serve one common aim. Organizational structure (rule) permits the expressed allocation of responsibilities for different functions and processes of diverse entities such as the branch, department, workgroup and individual. Individuals in political organizational structures are usually hired (elected) under time-limited work contracts (positions), work orders (administrations), or are under permanent employment contracts (Judicial) and program orders (Scales of Justice) and possess the power of influence to persuade.

The autonomously social variances of clustered entities or organizations are structured by many different techniques than that of construction by a charismatic style. Dependent on the atmosphere and objectives of solution, and order to clarify this meaning, the structure of any organization will determine the mode in which it operates and performs in addition to other orientations of organizational structures, both common and uncommon, their success is ever more becoming accepted standards (Historic Documents 2012).

Written in Historical Documents it is claimed that administrative restructuring is the tool used for making moral decisions or judgments in the best interest of the organization as well as to society. It is but an organizational theory but can well be illustrated by the philosophical model of The Constitution of the United States as the preamble fittingly reads, “We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America”, and is the tool of guidance (Historic Documents 2012).

Prior the first United States Constitution, A former visionary and United States president, Thomas Jefferson, exhibited brilliance in organizational techniques and skills. He envisioned a society full of individual liberty and ‘autonomous freedom’ for all. Though, it was not Jefferson’s original ideal (previously voiced by John Locke and the Continental thinkers), Jefferson summarized Locke’s idea by using his personal subjective autonomous behavior. Jefferson was straightforward, open minded and of honest character. History tells us that in June 1776, Thomas Jefferson then drafted the

Declaration of Independence. It is one of the most cherished symbols of liberty in the United States today and a tribute by Jefferson to the vital process of allowing many values embraced by the varied hearts of the American people (Historic Documents 2012).

At the Constitutional Convention, the Founding Fathers conceived an entirely new framework of government. Many representatives questioned each other over redrafts of the Articles of the Constitution. The several sessions that barred many attendance, and although many important issues were in question, the most important ones focused on was deciding on exactly how much power should be allocated to central government, how many representatives in Congress would be permitted in each state, and how those representatives would be elected, by the people or the legislators themselves. A solution was needed, and so after many intensive hours of labor, the many philosophers, then on September 17, 1787, the United States Constitution was born. Still standing today as a model of cooperative statesmanship, it is the sculptured component of the art of organizational structure (rule), theory and negotiations by origin; it is the source of administration negotiation and policymaking processes (Historic Documents 2012).

#### **i. Autonomy, Politics, Causation and Empowerment**

In the article titled “Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy” from the Stanford Encyclopedia Collection claims individual autonomy is explained as a natural, basic moral and political value or mindset. Biological, and very much considered a modern development. And, the placement of this moral weight falls on an individual’s ability to govern him/her self independently of their place in a metaphysical order by the role or

social structures of political institutions becomes very much the product of human justification (Stanford 2010).

An example of autonomy in Social and Political Philosophies found under section 3.1-Autonomy, the Foundations of Liberalism, the intent is to quote Rawls by saying, “The conception of an autonomous person who’s diversity in numerous roles have various constructions of liberal political theory and principally serves as the model of a person whose perspectives are used to devise and justify political principles, as in social contract models of justice” (Rawls 1971)[1] (Stanford 2010). Personally in agreement, autonomy is a concern within organizational structure for such similarities attributed to the model citizen serving its basic interests reflected by all principles or items of necessity; basic liberties, opportunities, and other primary goods are fundamentally known to a healthy lifestyle no matter what ethical commitments, life plans, or other essentials a person might acquire (Kymlicka 1989, 10–19, Waldron 1993: 155–6) [2] (Stanford 2010).

In addition, Keornahan, Cornell, Young, Gould, and Hirschmann says that Autonomy is ascribed to persons or projected as an ideal in order to delineate and critique oppressive social conditions acquiring deliverance from what is considered a fundamental goal of justice whether or not the critiques are described as being within a liberal tradition or as a specific alternative to it (cf. Keornahan, Cornell, Young, Gould; cf. also Hirschmann 2002, 1–29) [3] (Stanford 2010).

In the next section, article number 3.5-Autonomy and Political Liberalism, from “Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy”, autonomy, is stated to be a historical result designed by social contracts traditional of political philosophy that consequently

rests on the awareness of popular sovereignty. Here the claim is that concepts of autonomy are centrally characterized by at least one dominant element of humanity, a traditional culture. The article tells us that a key alternative version of the liberal tradition perceives popular sovereignty, basically a collective expression of rational choice with principles of basic powerful political institutions merely instrumental in maximizing accumulative citizen welfare. Autonomy is considered a constitutive element of the widespread welfare (Stanford 2010).

Another author, Diana Brydon from the University of Western Ontario explains to us that autonomy is human nature; psychological, it is abundant by the quantity of personal decisions. These decisions are governed by this rule of autonomy, and this in deed makes up for quite a wonderful political backdrop (Brydon 2010). Brydon affirms autonomies familiarity more so amongst political theorists and philosophers than to literary critics, yet assumptions about autonomy motivate current beliefs about post-colonial and current globalization struggles (Brydon 2010).

In most circumstances conflict arises over whether autonomy is the key to democracy. However, it only points to knowledge, as generated within the framework of society generating the realism that discrimination is always temporal. Within the organizational structure sometimes the meaning becomes subdued, consequences of autonomous behavior having no sense of accuracy for a final understanding of the individuals' behavior. Basically behavior must be based on its own understanding. As always, the meaning of autonomy is controversial and subject to numerous interpretations furthering new perceptions day-to-day (Brydon 2010).



In Cornelius Castoriadis words, “Autonomy is the unlimited psychological self-question. It is about the law and its foundation as well as the capacity in light of interrogation, to make, to do and to institute. Therefore autonomy is the unknown self-reflection and activity of reason by creating self-identity in an endless movement, and both for individual and social reason is the form of responsible critical thinking and by decision-making, suffering or not from the quest of consequence. Castoriadis says, “Quite the dialogue”, by way of individuals within a society that are most truly capable of changing and regulating ones self for society as a whole” (Castoriadis 2012).

In text written for a “Var Makt” from a seminar held in Malmo, Sweden in November 2008 - Gilles Dauve surveyed the various theories of democracy and their limits. Dauve begins the seminar with hid quoting of Rousseau saying that it is very difficult to force obedience into whoever has no wish to command (Dauve 2008). Dauve claims that Rousseau was a major Geneva philosopher, writer, and composer of 18th-century ‘Romanticism’ political philosophy era who heavily influenced the American and French Revolution. Rousseau changed global development of modern political, sociological and educational thought, says Dauve. Dauve genuinely believes Rousseau stood correct in his analysis of human autonomy and organizational structure (Dauve 2008).

Dauve states that democracy claims to be the most difficult objective to achieve. Further claiming that autonomy is one of the most vital ideals of human belief. And in actuality autonomy is the simple practice of collective freedom. Dauve says, “Democracy is equated with organizing social life by common decisions which take into account the needs and desires as much as possible for the people” (Dauve 2008). And he claims that

this particular model disputes autonomy as more than just an ideal, but more like the process of common improper and proper autonomous decision-making consequence that are required to materialize into conditions of true equality among all citizens alike or not (Dauve 2008).

Borgatti alleges, “The objective is to understand why public and private administrative organizations have the structure they do, and by ‘structure’ meaning, what direction does the organization operate” (Borgatti 2010). Adamant, Borgatti conveys to his readers that many organizations are run by degree and type of horizontal differentiation, vertical differentiation, and other mechanisms like coordination, control, but the formalization and centralization of power within an organization is the key to their success (Borgatti 2010).

Borgatti’s Contingency theory differs in relevancy to organizational structure from most classical scholars. Some believe there is only one way to run an organization. But, in contrast, Borgatti says he disagrees. Borgatti claims that most theorists today believe there is no ‘single’ best way to run an organization. Matter of fact there are many, especially when speaking in terms of politics by using guidelines, but that it is important to remember the imperativeness there be able-bodied people in authoritative positions amid all organizational structures, its size, its technologies, and the requirements of its environment (Borgatti 2010).

## **ii. Patriotism an American culture**

Culture is a group of people who's shared beliefs and practices identify them to a particular place, class, or time to which they belong with diverse, but a particular set of attitudes that characterize that group of people. Culture is a set of values, conventions, or social practices associated with a particular field, activity, or societal characteristics of humans shared alike and unlike

Culture is social behavior that developing customary beliefs, and practices. Culture is a social system with norms having material traits (e.g. political, racial and religious social groups), the have typical characteristic features of everyday existence shared by many different people in a particular place or time; a particular nation or civilization. Culture is having a set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and or practices characterizing institution and organization, or even a corporate culture focused on a particular substance (e.g. constituents, money, etc.).

John Paul Sartre claimed, "The basic distinction between establishing independence is the prime essential to live out liberty and nationalistic allegiance, but risks are a fundamental disconnect to the purpose of what is called 'consensual union.' The meaning, its certainty or uncertainty of the idea of independence, routinely ignored and often purged from the gala" (Sartre 2005). Sartre says this behavior is like a celebration for the sake of ignorant enjoyment, ignoring the solemn legacy of our nations founders. And, Sartre reply states, "Yet, those who rally their attention on charismatic political patriotic fervor produce an even more profound error by continuing to play their role in our political system at all levels of government, as well as in our own lives" (Sartre 2005).

Bertell Ollman, author of *What Role Does Patriotism Play in Capitalist Democracy: Particularly Ours / Particularly Now*, writes in his article, *In the Crimean War*, there was an English officer who had misinterpreted an order and made the mistake directing a cavalry charge against a heavily fortified Russian location that led to the slaughter of the entire company of six hundred men. Rather than find fault on the officer or question the sense of the soldiers who only committed suicide (patriotism). Ollman says that the famous poet named Tennyson wrote a poem thereafter and that it went something like this, “Someone had blundered, and theirs not to make reply, theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die and into the Valley of Death rode the six hundred” (Ollman 2012).

Ollman says the message is clear by Tennyson’s thoughts. And, that during war, patriotism encompasses the following of orders without reflection of whether the orders were right or wrong, or do they bare logic. Ollman calls it “Love of country”(Ollman 2012). He tells us that patriotism becomes absolute and complete in obedience to a country and its government, and since the existing government is not the country, it only becomes a go-between, a current substitute in its name. The question of what patriotism really is raises critical doubts. It is certain that the mystery of patriotism, its origin, what drives it, and how it works continues to puzzle us all. As per Ollman, “It is the unraveling of the mystery that becomes more clouded with each new patriotic outburst” (Ollman 2012).

Ollman asks, “Why was the biggest Governmental assault on the American Bill of Rights in the last 200 years packaged as the “Patriot Act”, and so why then such ostensible

disapproval directed against those who may criticize the Government in any area that of unpatriotic behavior (us/them) (Ollman 2012). Ollman claims, “Patriotism is particularly dangerous to the Left, because it both isolates and confuses us. Ollman asks, “where are the good Marxist or otherwise radical subject of the study of patriotism, especially today when we most need them” (Ollman 2012).

An example given by Ollman was the flood of patriotism after 9/11, which put the people on an influential collision course. Patriotism also often leads to the easy dismissal of our criticisms possibly threatening our jobs, friendships and personal security. Long standing, many suggest that patriotism between workers in the U.S. and other capitalist countries exists central to the psychological barrier of the socialist revolution in the 20th century. Ollman simply states are we as a nation really serious about this? Cause if so, this is an exaggeration, not a very big one per say due to the obvious problem that we need to address and understand when it comes to patriotism and much better than we do at the current (Ollman 2012).

While patriotism is a mixture of beliefs and emotions, in final it deserves to be treated vital by its mysteries associated and autonomous subjugation. Still, another reason why it is wrong to emphasizing human visual creativity when explaining nationalism/patriotism. Ollman details facts by telling us, “Most patriotic ideas, after all, are largely simple rationalizations for feelings and many patriots seem willing to take action on these feelings in the absence of any serious attempt to make sense of them. Patriotism feels good, something most radicals who have difficulties coming to terms with it” (Ollman 2012).

Ollman speaks about the kinds of items that make a person feel well. In general he is saying that items (assets, control, independence, money) serve as more than basic needs that aren't being met can't make you feel good, but to think of how good we can feel even when our demanding needs for food or sex are satisfied. Ollman believes similar to patriotism, not in itself, but for something else that involves under at the present circumstances that best satisfies individuals, but only partially in a distorted manner. Ollman adamant says, "At issue are the genuine human needs for fellowship and recognition that comes from our membership in the human species as well as a historically conditioned social need for unanimity that arises out of our experience of cooperation in the social community" (Ollman 2012).

Ollman states that we live in a competitive society where sharing and showing mutual concern are typically penalized, and at times even ridiculed. In short by community deception where there are few occasions to express feelings of fellowship that are accepted. "Consequently", says Ollman, "Almost any opportunity displayed or shared by all is absorbed by greed of religious expression, cheering together at sporting events, singing and swaying together at concerts, or marching together in parades obviously displaying a greater hunger for community and one that people's current lives as workers, students, consumers and citizens to include religion, mass spectator sports, music, dance, and parades, but alone will never satisfy" (Ollman 2012).

Per Ollman, "Although it seems as though patriotism works temporarily offering people the opportunity to vent their deepest communal emotions in all venues, twenty-four hours a day, in a socially acceptable, indeed, socially praiseworthy of catering to society and

experienced as very pleasurable, patriotism is evermore a want hard to resist” (Ollman 2012).

The President is in the best position to be the voice of legitimacy due to his position as head of the state, where the state itself has adopted the flag; both are symbols viewed as vital legitimate organs of the social community. In the belief that it is hard to challenge the President’s right to speak for the flag (America). Temporal, nonetheless, patriotism continues to be redefined and refined by societies of the state that they do not serve everyone equally (Ollman 2012).

Ollman insists there are main efforts directed to serve only the ruling class of economy, reproducing the conditions of its existence within itself (ruling class). Ollman says that in capitalism, essentially helping the capitalist class acquire more capital by recognizing their products value, limiting the opposition of their unfair rule and the legitimization during procedures by occurrence to include many forms of the capitalist state (Ollman 2012). “Automatically”, says Ollman again, “For its the way the state’s success legitimatizes capitalism, at best instills a measurability of the state in order to be its own successor” (Ollman 2012).

In final, Ollman declares, “To do this job well, the state has to appear legitimate in the eyes of most of its citizens, which requires above everything else that its consistent partiality on behalf of the capitalist ruling class be disguised. The flag like other patriotic symbols (Public Administration, President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Congress, House and Senate) as is patriotism a very critical product by all efforts to achieve to sustain success as a nation” (Ollman 2012).

## **2. One Local Mayors viewpoint**

In February 2011, the city of Anderson, Indiana, Mayor Kris Ockomon met with me for a short time discussing our focus on administration, autonomy and politics. Ockomon told me his personal concerns, experience, ideas, thoughts and his own personal perception historically in correlation to our case study focal points. Like any other elected official, Mayor Ockomon claimed that his role as a politician, and having what he called ‘a voted power’ (electorate) and given the authoritative power to control, influence, and decide in the best interest of the citizens must require autonomy that demands the utmost accuracy, rationality and honesty in his executive decision making methods.

Ockomon claims that honest administrative prospects are achieved well without stretching the facts. And, that statement caught my attention to ask the mayor exactly what he meant by it. He simply stated that Government must never lie to the voters, to not betray the public at large, is to gain prosperity for society. Ockomon then commented further, Ockomon says, “Administrative ideas are consequentially important decisions, and making decisions have consequences. Administrative decisions made nationwide or at any level of government are decision that are made continuously, whether public or private administrations must include the relevancy of historical political events in order to deal with the present and betterment for our nations future” (Ockomon 2011).

Ockomon told me when he thinks about autonomy, decision-making and politics as they are interwoven, the reality of it, is that our American ancestors have already defined them. “And, says Ockomon, “Although we may all be born under the same stars, no one acts, thinks or reacts alike, and for that matter, neither do people decide the same way.



The only similarities that reside within man in general become element as humans when we must chose to decide to be honest or dishonest, first with ourselves, and next to others. This is the ultimate test of the human autonomy” (Ockomon 2011).

Mayor Ockomon told me that Government was one of his favorite subjects back in High School and College before becoming a police officer, then Mayor. He began telling me about the First Continental Congress, Independence and our First National Government. “Right up my alley”, said Ockomon, I believe you have picked a very good topic Martina to write about. Then asked me, if I knew that in September 1774, every colony but Georgia sent their representatives to a special meeting called the First Continental Congress (Ockomon 2011).

Ockomon then swiftly sat up in his chair, leaned forward and said, “Ah yes, it was a vital historical event. He told me that during this meeting representatives of The First Continental Congress communicated autonomously back and forth the needs of the people, for their rights were being violated. The people argued for themselves and their colonies. With great support from the colonies, together wrote a letter to King George declaring their intent to break away from Great Britain’s power with a desire for liberty. The consequences of their decision were immediate. The British government enforced even stricter rules upon the colonies, and shortly thereafter initiated the Revolutionary War” (Ockomon 2011).

### **i. Mayor Ockomon and Autonomous decision-making acknowledged**

Mayor Ockomon claimed he too genuinely carries a vast concern for self-autonomy. Ockomon said that public inquiries in connection to autonomy, decision-making and politics begins with organizational structure and the general need to assess government when creating policy, but those decisions are made by individuals who already have predetermined beliefs, values, and desires, and those individuals, just as you and I, by nature, act on those basis consistently, once again its called human nature” (Ockomon 2011).

Ockomon points out whether or not similar, a person’s beliefs, desires and values are typical of society naturally indicating individual and significant aspects of who a person is, “Once a person has determined what his/her beliefs, values and desires are, they must act without failure on the basis of those beliefs and desires. The more consistently an individual acts upon their beliefs and desires, the more autonomously they are acting, the less consistent a person acts on the basis of their beliefs and desires, the less autonomous they are” (Ockomon 2011). On the other hand, Ockomon believes such behaviors in politics can intensify both in a positive and negative way depending on an individual’s position in administration that possesses colossal amounts of influence (power) (Ockomon 2011).

### **ii. The First and Second Continental Congress and Independence**

Ockomon tells me, “The biggest part of individual autonomy is recognizing our own character and personality. Reiterating, Ockomon says, “As humans we are honest or lie

by nature” (Ockomon 2011). Performing autonomously means to act on the basis of individual character (personality) traits that come naturally, claiming we are who we are certain at birth, but in some instances and depending on a person’s influential upbringing and guidance, a person is capable of change. The consequence of change is a gamble that people take when making decisions, and although political decision makers may affect many people in society, whether negative or positive, like any other human, a politician’s autonomous views and decisions that are made in their best natural born autonomous behavior just as was with the First and Second Continental Congress members maintaining independence (Ockomon 2011).

### **iii. Congress and the Declaration of Independence**

Mayor Ockomon claimed, “Patriotic or not, people may dispute particular autonomous political decisions made by government, quite possibly even some of the decisions or changes he made for the city of Anderson, but from the Governor of Indiana who also makes many decisions to, congress, and the President of the United States. The need to recognize these very reasons for inspirational autonomy as previously exhibited by the philosophers of The First, the Second Continental Congress and the Declaration of Independence Ockomon says, “Changes are made for progressing society as a whole in positives ways, and it depends on power or charisma, sometimes, in a negative way that creates genuine autonomous political thinkers alike or not by their action and reason” (Ockomon 2011). He claims that The Second Continental Congress’s meeting was a final, clear, and concise, no cutting to the chase (red tape), and not to mention autonomously precise and with many reasons affirming the injustices made towards the

people of their colonies. By re-stating the necessary freedoms from Great Britain, a new development of both administrative and individual autonomy was made contemporaneously” (Ockomon 2011).

Mayor Ockomon in final stated, “In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote that all natural rights of the people could not be taken away or ignored. He said that Thomas Jefferson did indeed autonomously argued this fact, but also acted on behalf of the people in their best interest by his natural own performance of professionalism and his natural born or influential autonomous decision-making abilities” (Ockomon 2011). Ockomon ended our interview by saying that Jefferson’s final decision to once and for all state the people’s rights that were being denied, and signing the Declaration proclaimed independence for all a new country, our country, the good ole’ USA. Obviously this was a positive approach on the part of autonomous decision making that became a nationalistic event (Ockomon Kris 2011).

### **C. President Ronald Reagan in History**

#### **1. From Hollywood Actor to President of the United States**

In consideration of the late President Ronald Reagan, the Hollywood Actor turned politician, who became President of the United States, was one president who made many autonomous decisions, either positive or negative, those decisions by political affiliation were made on behalf of the both the electorate’s autonomous decisions to elect and by his administration. Evaluating and examining the many decisions made by President Ronald Reagan’s administration produced many apparent changes that were predominantly all

too common for the customary political backdrop. Politicians alike who encompass the plight of many different political attitudes have been divided and characterized by two groups. Those groups, the Democrats and Republicans both are autonomous decision makers with dissimilar or similar beliefs; desires and values, but often differ from the other group, sometimes within the group and by other people of the United States.

Situated throughout history and to the current, our political establishment by its maintenance of social order has always been the thought or perception of these political activities by autonomous political nature in decision-making and such association has caused inquiries as to which these decisions benefit. But do they benefit the rich or the poor? That's the question and the answer at times amongst constituents may seem regarded as deceitful, corrupt and powerful political policy practices being made by our very own government having been entrusted with such freedoms of autonomy to do so, and with the attained power voted into office by us, the people.

The wonderful online source Spartacus Educational.Com authored by John Simkin offers quite a bit of background researching the historical practices of President Ronald Reagan. Simkin tells us information anyone can find such as; President Ronald Reagan was born to John Reagan and Nellie Wilson on February 06, 1911 above a local general store in Tampico, Illinois. Simkin also tells us that after the family moved 100 miles west of Chicago, to the little town of Dixon, Ronald's father became a partner in a shoe store. Ronald's father held left of center political views and bravely spoke out against the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. During the Great Depression Ronald's father was forced to close his shoe store only to find a new job as a result of the New Deal. In the aftermath

thereafter both father and son became fervent supporters of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party (Simkin 2011).

### **i. Reagan and the Cinema**

Simkin writes that on the Hollywood Screen Reagan appeared in a series of undistinguished films like *Hollywood Hotel* (1937), *Love is on the Air* (1937), *Accidents Will Happen*, *Boy Meets Girl* and *Brother Rat* (1938), *Cowboy From Brooklyn* and *Sergeant Murphy* (1938). Reagan also made appearances in *Angels Wash Their Faces* (1939), *An Angel from Texas* and *The Santa Fe Trail* (1940). And, when the United States entered World War II Reagan joined the Army Air Corps making training films for pilots. Discharged in December 1945, as a captain, Reagan resumed his film career appearing in *the Stallion Road* (1947), *The Hagan Girl* (1947) and (1947), *The Voice of the Turtle*” (Simkin 2011).

Simkin informs his readers on Spartacus’s Educational web site that Reagan was a member of the Screen Actors Guild and elected president of the organization in 1974. Having a reputation as a liberal, Reagan soon converted becoming a Democrat when the House of Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), chaired by J. Parnell Thomas began an in depth investigation into the Hollywood Motion Picture Industry (Simkin 2011). Simkin says the conclusion was HUAC interviewed 41 people who worked in Hollywood, named “the friendly witnesses” (Simkin 2011). Voluntarily, these individuals named 19 other people during the interviews accusing them of holding left-wing views. One of those named, Bertolt Brecht, an emigrant playwright, who left for East Germany after gave evidence, ten others who refused to give evidence were Herbert Biberman,

Lester Cole, Albert Maltz and Adrian Scott. The rest of the group were Samuel Ornitz, Dalton Trumbo, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner Jr., John Howard Lawson and Alvah Bessie and they were all known as The Hollywood Ten. Simkin conveys, “The Hollywood Ten declared their 5th Amendment rights of the United States Constitution. The House of Un-American Activities Committee and the courts during appellant procedures disagreed and all ‘Ten’ were found guilty in contempt of congress and each were sentenced to do six to twelve months in prison” (Simkin 2011).

Simkin shapes the facts telling us that during these investigations Ronald Reagan had been a supporter of McCarthyism, which allowed Reagan to continue working in Hollywood, but his films continued, but shown second-rate (b) films. The movies were “Bedtime for Bongo and The Last Outpost in 1951, The Winning Team in 1952, Law and Order in 1953, Cattle Queen of Montana in 1954, Tennessee's Partner by 1955 and Hellcats in the Navy in 1957. Simkin says, “Later on from 1954 to 1962 Reagan hosted the General Electric’s weekly half-hour drama television show” (Simkin 2011).

## **ii. Democrat, Republican and Liberal preferences by association by event**

Simkin declares that Ronald Reagan had been a loyal Democratic Party supporter in the 1930’s and 1940’s. But switched to the Republican Party after the war ended supporting Dwight Eisenhower (1952 and 1956) and Richard Nixon in 1960. Then, In 1964 Reagan became quite a national political figure. It was the result of Reagan’s televised public speech where Reagan backed Barry Goldwater. Simkin states, “Goldwater did not win the election due to the fact that most people in the United States simply envisioned him as a very dangerous, right wing extremist” (Simkin 2011). However, convincing the

members of the Californian business community Reagan was a man with the charm that sold right-wing extremist, for later Reagan would be approached and by request, to become the next converted Republican candidate for the Governor of California seat. Promising tax cuts, Reagan won an easy victory with the help of a smear campaign against Pat Brown (Simkin 2011).

Simkin says, “As governor, Ronald Reagan quickly established himself as one of the country’s leading conservative political figures of dramatic budget cuts and a hiring freeze for state agencies” (Simkin 2011). Later Re-elected only by two per cent of half the votes. In 1970 Ronald Reagan also presented a series of welfare reforms during his second term. Simkin expresses “These reforms included restricting the eligibility requirements for welfare aid by requiring those able to seek work should, rather than receiving benefits. However, the tax cuts never came, in fact, he presided over the largest tax increase any state had ever sought in American history” (Simkin 2011).

Reagan also previously had rejected two outstanding cabinet officers offered by President Gerald Ford then in 1975. Instead Reagan declared his presidential candidacy for the Republican Party against Ford. Reagans presidential campaign manager in place of the officers offered by Ford became Michael K. Deaver who worked for Ronald Reagan during Reagan’s time as governor of California. Simkin states, “Deaver also co-founded the public relations company, ‘Deaver and Hannaford’ in 1975 that booked all of Ronald Reagan’s public appearances, he researched and sold Reagan’s radio program as well, and while both Deaver and Hannaford where ghost writing Reagan’s apparent successful



syndicated column, in the end Ford would defeat Reagan in his challenge and win the presidency (Simkin 2011).

### **iii. The Financial Support (Backing) of the Reagan Campaign**

Joining the Justice Department in 1977 as foreign agents, Deaver and Hannaford were paid \$5,000 a month by the government of Taiwan. They were also earning \$11,000 a month paid by Amigos del Pais (Friend of the Country) in Guatemala. In charge of Amigos del Pais was Roberto Alejos Arzu, who was chief organizer of Guatemala's "Reagan for President" organization. Arzu, an (asset) to the CIA in 1960 allowed use of his plantation for the training of Cuban exiles during the Bay of Pigs invasion. Disputed by Peter Dale Scott who stated that Michael K. Deaver was raising funds for Ronald Reagan's presidential campaign from personal Guatemalan clients to include Amigos del Pais. In a final Report by the BBC, the expected amount of money tallied around ten million dollars. Simkin says, "A known fact that Francisco Villgaran Kramer asserted there were many members of this organization directly linked with organized terror" (Simkin 2011).

Simkin also says that Peter Dale Scott argues the these funds came from military dictatorships who'd help pay for Deaver and Hannaford's offices that became Reagan's initial campaign headquarters in Beverly Hills including Reagan's Washington office. This argument caused Ronald Reagan to develop the catch phrase saying, "No more Taiwan's, no more Vietnams, no more betrayals" (Ronald Reagan). And "Reagan also contended that if he was elected president of the United States he would re-establish official relations between the United States Government and Taiwan" (Simkin 2011).

Another client of Deaver's was Argentina's military regime. And, according to Simkin, "It was a regime who murdered about 15,000 of its political opponents". Deaver indeed arranged for Jose' Alfredo Martinez de Hoz (economic minister) to visit the United States, and in a Reagan radio broadcast, Martinez de Hoz claimed that in the process of bringing stability to a terrorized nation of 25 million, "just a small number of people were caught in the cross-fire, amongst them only a few were innocent" (Martinez de Hoz, 1979). Deaver's clients whether Guatemala, Taiwan and Argentinian, they were only after they're greatest desires. Those desires were to obtain American arms. Simkin claims to us that it was prior to Reagan's campaign and during the Jimmy Carter administration, that the arms sales to Taiwan had been reduced for diplomatic reasons having been completely cut off to Guatemala and Argentina because of human rights violations (Simkin 2011).

Reagan's focal point was now he was sixty-eight years old and his opponents claimed he was too old to achieve presidency and balancing such a position of great responsibility. But, by Reagan campaigning aggressively despite his tendency to make impractical and factual mistakes during interviews he generally performed well overcoming all campaign obstacles before him. During Reagan's campaign he promised a "patriotic crusade" by reducing the size and scope of government, by rebuilding American military power with dignity while restoring traditional values" (Simkin 2011).

#### **iv. From President Jimmy Carter to Reagan**

During Reagan's campaign he learned President Carter was making attempts to negotiate an agreement with Iran for the release of American hostages. This was not good news for

Reagan's campaign. Simkin declares, "If Carter was able to negotiate", says, Simkin, "The release of hostages before the election and the public would have viewed him as being of noble character, possible of change and possibly re-elected for a second-term" (Simkin, 2011). Simkin states that not long thereafter Deaver reportedly told the New York Times that one of the things they decided initially that a Reagan victory would be nearly impossible if hostages were released before the election was over. Simkin states the inevitable; "No doubt that euphoria of the masses would spread across America like a tidal wave if hostages had been released, and Carter would have been the hero, so many of the complaints against him would have been forgotten as he would have sure won" (Simkin 2011).

Basically the many ill autonomous decisions made subsequent to and during President Carter's administration, these decisions were now in the hands of and made by the new elected president of the United States, Ronald Reagan. Reagan then with his administration in accordance with both the 97th and 98th Congresses in his first term would alter America in an unanticipated economical way. Reagan's administration altered the America's economical structure in an enormous way (Ssapotluck 2011).

To start with, Reagan's administration along with members of congress restricted and eliminated not only student's benefits for college, but also social security eligibility and benefits for all unknowing young widows/widowers, divorced widows/widowers, wives and husbands. Reagan's administration made the most extensive cuts in history to the social security administration, and then made part of social security benefits taxable income. Reagan with the help of his administration also accomplished modifying the

rules of government pension offsets while increasing the full retirement age. Also restricting the eligibility of lump sum death payments made to survivors of the deceased (Ssapotluck 2011).

#### **D. Belief Systems**

Belief systems are a set of mutually supportive beliefs. The beliefs may be religious, philosophical, ideological or a combination of these given social perception and structures of logic, fallacies, influence, persuasion and the suppression of sound ideas.

##### **1. Chris Trueman's interpretation of the United States Constitution**

Chris Trueman is the author of an online history-learning site that began in 2000.

Trueman made available to students online assessable and comprehensive information about American politics. Trueman has written all content from his personal knowledge of history and having taught both history and politics at a major college in England for the last 26 years. He says that beliefs and values most commonly found in American politics, if understood is the political psyche that exists in America. Those same beliefs and values have filtered into three areas, as Trueman says is, "The executive, legislative and judicial systems that makes up the American political structure and the Constitution of the United States" (Trueman 2000).

Trueman believes that the American political culture organizes changes of adaptation as a result of several complex processes such as socialization and feedback from the political system with our United States Constitution in summary by establishing a U.S. federal system of government (law) becoming a landmark document. And says that many

individuals can develop political beliefs from their parents, friends and others. Truman says, “By this socialization individuals may develop similar or dissimilar political responses to certain political issues, policy or law as a part of their autonomous (independent) belief system” (Trueman 2000).

As far as the United States Constitution in connection President Reagan’s administration by way of autonomous decision-making, well it led to a “Reagonomic belief system”.

Belief systems are a set of organized societal and numerous mutual supported beliefs that are especially related to religious and political beliefs (e.g. ideological and philosophical) and both a common combination that forms a unified system, single unit or entity as is written in the United States Constitution, says, Trueman” (Trueman 2000).

Trueman says that nearly every American would agree that the origin of our belief system and valuing individual freedom, individualism, and independence are the basis of our American standards. It filters all characteristics of our society through the ideas of all people including those with power by having control over his or her destiny.

Consequently encouraging the most recognized models of government together with the Constitution of the United States should and must provide a guarantee that our entitlements as US citizens are supported (Trueman 2000).

#### **i. Democracy**

Democracy is an egalitarian (equality) form of government in which all the citizens of a nation together determine public policy. In the book titled “The United States Government-Democracy in Action” we can learn to understand this better by knowing

back when the Revolutionary war was in full force, Congress was writing an official document that would display the rules for our national government while the states were writing their own constitutions similar to other states. The book claims that our government wrote our constitution(s) in essence to those same belief systems. The only plan was for a limited government. And after many Americans had been neglected and abused of their rights by Great Britain's King, no one wanted leaders to abuse their power anymore upon the people. So the decision was made to reducing all governors' power from every state. The decision was made in regards to saving the legacy of a representative government by the people for the people in free and equal representation (National Government 2002-03).

With Congress and the states in agreement the representatives authoring the Articles of Confederation prepared us for a national government. Although Congress was still was in charge of a weak national government since they had no executive or judicial branches under the Articles of Confederation it allowed the states to continue possessing the most power until 1781 when the Articles of Confederation finally became law of the people (National Government 2002-03).

By 1787 new plans were made to rewrite the Articles of Confederation because of the problems of Congress being able to tax the states enabling them to generate revenue for having an army or to pay back war debt. Under this new proposal, the Constitution of the United States was written creating a whole new government, forming a union. The Constitution became the new law by the people for the people in 1788. The Constitution is still absolute law currently in the United States. It justifies all powers in our society

both by all national and federal levels of government. Its purpose is based on five basic principles. The first is sovereignty (The People), second is a limited government (rules), then separation of powers (division), also checks and balances (limited power), and in final we have what is called (more power) (National Government 2002-03).

## **ii. Sovereignty**

Although the meaning has varied throughout history, sovereignty is the quality of having the highest, independent authority over a geographic area, namely territory. It can be found in a power to rule and make law and sovereignty in the United States to the people is measured in the highest degree by permitting government its authority over society by way of the electorates. By allowing powerful political representatives to speak for them (society) as is written in the Constitution. It begins as such; ‘We the People of the United States, and by having a limited government’... interprets the rules and restrictions that government must follow. Our Constitution lists these specific rules that government must follow (may or may not do). One example is our government does not allow titles of nobility to or upon its citizens. And, so by this separation of power, it distributes power and responsibilities among the three branches of national governments (i.e. legislative, executive, and judicial branches), ensuring no single entity can abuse its power over the other by having federalism, which means a principle of our federal political system (National Government 2002-03).

### **iii. Public Policy**

Public policy can be identified as the attempt made by a government to address a public issue in order to institute laws, regulations, decisions, or actions pertinent to the problem at hand. Many issues can be addressed by public policy including crime, education, foreign policy, health, and social welfare. By public having the capacity to understand and reply to such actions and decisions of policy makers, it becomes the basis of a representative democracy in the United States. And due to lacking communication, an extensive frame of research works are used to understand how public opinion responds to all policymaking activity (Faricy, Ellis 2011)

Obviously apparent, many policy scholars thoroughly understand the American system of social policy on more of a broad spectrum. Faricy and Ellis say, “It is a divided system in which the government finances both public programs through direct spending via budgetary appropriations and private benefits are routed through indirect spending otherwise known as tax expenditures” (Faricy & Ellis, 2011). Faricy and Ellis say that these very diverse policy tools are considered nonetheless than a spending for federal budgetary purposes only signifying the different roles of government within the economy, and that the American public has always observed and participated in important debates over the divided social system (Faricy, Ellis 2011).

The best example given by Faricy and Ellis is partial privatization of Social Security that replaces little direct government spending on income security with government-based incentives for private retirement savings. Both Faricy and Ellis say, “Democrats call for a public option to compete with private health care insurance plans that allow an increase



in direct government spending on public health, perhaps at the expense of some indirect spending which incentivizes the private provision of health care” (Faricy, Ellis 2011). As more recent debates focus enduring disputes over the right function and responsibility of the federal government in aiding the provisions of the most usual and common social goals, they will continue to cover the income security, education, and public health (Faricy, Ellis 2011).

Faricy and Ellis say that the exclusion of indirect spending in empirical work on public responsiveness to government activity is important for two central reasons. First, they say, “The indirect spending represents the government’s substantial role in subsidizing the private-sector social benefits not accounting for the \$600 billion in federal spending in 2009 alone” (Faricy, Ellis 2011).

One of the most important acknowledgements since deliberate indirect spending plays a far different role in economy than direct spending does. Indirect spending allows additional privileges in market above all government-based conceptions of power. By funding these programs they primarily benefit the wealthy. Indirect spending exists tending to redistribute the wealth in an upward motion rather than descend. The speculative focus on direct appropriations implies and accepts that public reaction to government spending is driven solely by the amount that government spends in particular social domains, instead of accounting for in what way the money is spent, or to whom such benefits of government spending accrue (Faricy, Ellis 2011).

In context the implementation of policymaking supports facts that are just the exact requirement; a priority of society as is for (all) participants involved in the policy-making

process. The common belief is that when government completes all the decisions of a policy, the decision is final. Misfortunate for those in general summarizing such concerns of those that need to be addressing policy because all too often not, the problem for those of power and wealth over the entire process by their personal individuality, personal interests, political affiliations, and other, “The seriousness of diminishing biases include assumptions of consequences of the complete process of policy making using the correct projected tools where vanity might actually resulted in rational process. All-inclusive, and still, public policy stands to be key in addressing social concerns” (Faricy, Ellis 2011).

#### **E. Political Concepts of Evolution**

Political concepts of evolution are human ideas that are concerned with the evolution of any type of development, growth, progress and the advancement for society as a whole. Intentional or unintentional to abuse this concept of evolution was never intended by the means of a binomial Democracy or a two-part (Democrat/Republican) division with consequences even bigger as in the division between the rich and poor. These ideas like others are accurate realizations of political evolution. Political concepts of evolution in theory are apathetic concepts and ideas of politicians by developmental exemplar of our nations earliest forms of government. As is with ideas of evolution, the slow but gradual developments of autonomy, the beliefs and practices of political decision makers for policy issues that decide these issues for our society as a nation.

Human history proves evolution is a reality. Nearly ten thousand years ago people living small groups allowed less than a dozen local people to control their entire private affairs

proving ever more our ancestors who settled into villages were self-governed. Only three thousand years later original multi-community societies began naming chiefdoms as their leaders. The chiefdom was one person that had effective political control over two or more villages. Through the ages, the chiefdoms integrated a strong central government, strong enough to tax, draft, and legislate. With this came social divisions. Becoming more than familiar, the present-day is not impartial to any town, state or country, but to the rich, the poor, the rulers and the ruled on a two party political policy agenda. The cultures of state-level societies differ greatly today than from the village civilizations recognized early on (Graber 1995).

### **1. Political Evolution; Development, Growth, Progress and Achievement**

Chiefdoms like the many states that developed independently in several places around the world. As humans continued living in bands and villages in many places, and in 1970, three kinds of circumstances had been identified by a man named Robert L. Carneiro, promoting evolution”, says Graber (Graber 1995). In recognition of the first being environmental limits by means of fertile land more or less tailored in by mountains, deserts, or water. The second being circumstantial productive resources concentrated near lakes and streams so eye-catching that people would try to stay near them. The last is social constraint. By being tailored not only by geographical landscapes but also by other societies, agricultural growth made land endlessly limited, defeating land wars that would eventually increase the abandoning of those people unsuccessful. With nowhere to go or escape defeat chiefdoms and the states became the result (Graber 1995).

Graber claims this has already been identified, and that “Political evolution is social growth that undeniably triggers culture to evolve in certain and definite ways. “By this comparison” says Graber, “and like anything else it also has its limits” (Graber 1995). Recognition is the discussing of political evolution with others to stop being normally overlooked or ignored. Under conviction Graber uses this example in confessing to the many parts of any organism (organization) by direct contact while the members of a society are not united by the efforts of development, growth, progress and the advancement for society as a whole, and this very lack of communication considerably reduces the difference (Graber 1995).

## **2. Political Evolution beliefs by Political Moguls**

Another author, Steve Verdon writes in an article about political beliefs on evolution and says his advice in comparison whose beliefs are similar at in agreement with describe well each individual candidate’s stance on political evolution, or their beliefs in simple evolution. Verdon argues that all politicians autonomously differ in opinion, knowledge and theory, but the only party that believes in evolution are the Democrats” (Verdon 2008).

Verdon claims there is quite the selection when it comes to the Republicans and their ideas of basic evolution for example, politicians like Mike Huckabee, the 44th Governor of Arkansas from 1996 to 2007. “Huckabee”, says Verdon, “Believes the world was literally made in seven days” (Verdon 2008). Verdon gives his perspective to certain fears by the people called “sophisticated political views”, identifying Mitt Romney, a Republican American businessman, and the 70th Governor of Massachusetts from 2003

to 2007, who ran for President of the United States in 2008, unsuccessful, but now exploring possible presidential candidacy in the 2012 election can be described as a ‘theistic evolutionary’. Verdon tells us that Romney believes that evolutionary processes are at work, that is evolutions shaped man, and there is no reason to say or believe otherwise that God might not have had some role in the process (Verdon 2008).

Another example given by Verdon, was John McCain, senior United States Senator from Arizona, also a Republican and nominee for president in the 2008 election, seemed to be all over the map stating back in 2007 he believed in evolution. Claims Verdon, “Which is a good thing since evolution is a fact”, says, Verdon (Verdon 2008). However, back in 2005 Verdon said that McCain expressed sympathy for the pseudo-scientific concepts of intelligent design claiming that it should be taught in schools. “And”, claims Verdon, “A year later in 2006, McCain again expressed sympathy, but this time for those who held beliefs that the world was created in a week” (Verdon 2008).

Verdon also stated that Rudy Giuliani, an American lawyer, businessman, and politician from New York, who served as the Mayor of New York City from 1994 to 2001, but held the Democrat and Independent ticket in the 1970s, later turned Republican in 1980 and served in the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York. Then, Verdon says, “Ultimately, Giuliani became a U.S. Attorney that prosecuted numerous high-profile cases, including ones against organized crime and Wall Street financiers, was always very evasive concerning his views about evolution” (Verdon 2008).

Verdon verbalizes, “One true to form Republican named Dr. Congressman Ron Paul, an American medical doctor, the Republican U.S. Congressman for the 14th congressional district of Texas, also serves on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, the Committee on Financial Services and is Chairman of the House Financial Services Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, has been an outspoken critic of current American both foreign and monetary policies has a rather outlandish eccentric view for as medical doctor that claims evolution is just a bogus theory” (Verdon 2008).

Verdon admits when it comes to his judgment, for the Republican view, he finds Romney as most appealing. However, several of Romney’s speeches on religion and so forth, did not view Romney as a very appealing candidate overall. Verdon says, “Romney’s economic views leave him feeling quite frigid” (Verdon 2008). For the scientifically illiterate, Verdon says that evolution is a fact not just a theory. Just like theories of gravity are just theories, Verdon tells his readers, “Ridiculous, but if you wish please feel free to disbelieve and then by all means jump off a building (not advised)” (Verdon 2008).

Verdon expresses some things just never cease to amaze him, like politicians who support creationism, intelligent design, and then oppose the concept of evolution, any type of evolution “What amazing hypocrites, autonomously making their own personal decisions by offering answers to the solutions, making promises, making office and at the same time refuting the beliefs and interests of others” (Verdon 2008). Verdon tells us that some people will say things like evolution is only a theory. ‘No! It is not’, claims Verdon. But,

“Evolution is an organism that can, will and does change at inherited levels”, it is an observed fact as is the fact of autonomous behavior on every level of decision making in its own rationality forming a renewed generation of evolution in all forms that continues as always in society” (Verdon 2008).

Verdon lets us know that man has constructed, a myriad of explanatory facts and theories that purposely fall under a broad umbrella of evolution central to that of being only theory (Verdon 2008). When applied to other real supportive examples, such as dropping a coin, you will watch it fall to the floor every time, and of the billions of times people have dropped coins, those coins all fell to the floor. “But in light of the obvious”, claims Verdon, “There is no single theory of gravity due to gaps in all theory, and yes, like the many gaps in autonomous decision making by politicians in government affecting all people, including those relentless to believe in political evolution” (Verdon 2008).

#### **i. An American Constitutional Originality**

David Held is the author of *Democracy & the Global Order/From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. In his first chapter, ‘The Stories of Democracy, Old and New’, He writes, “Although scoring a historic victory, democracy over alternative forms of political governance, including the widespread commitment to democracy is not a recent phenomenon. The creation and maintenance of democracy is a remarkably difficult form of government revealing evidenced by serious threats to it, such as fascism, Nazism, or Stalinism” (Held 1995). Held asserts that a Liberal democracy has always been defended as the agent of progress, while Capitalism being worthy only as the viable economic system, and many people have already even proclaimed the ‘end of history’ as

an ideological conflict, something becoming steadily displaced by universal democratic reason and market-oriented thinking (Held 1995).

Held's interpretations on various inadequacies reveal distinctive liberal traditions having different concepts of the individual agent, autonomy, rights and the duties of subjects of proper nature and form by community as in evolution. Held calls it "The celebratory", a liberal democracy that neglects investigating whether there are any tensions contradictory of that between both the "liberal" and "democratic" components of a liberal democracy. By having a liberal preoccupation that deals with individual rights and democratic concerns, the regulation of individual and collective action for public accountability, Held says, "There is more than one institutional form of liberal democracy, and making any appeal to a liberal position would be vague at best (Held 1995).

Held believes if society is to move forward from the specifications of our historical theoretical framework and analysis of democracy and global order must commence. Held explains to us that there must be an examination of all developments from the many diverse models of democracy amongst their conditions of application that must apply. And, one of the true essentials to this is to explore deep within the meaning of democracy, and context within its entirety, not just the progressives catch all that at current resides in the states, global and regional networks. Held articulates on the many countless and leading approaches required to assure the accuracy of understanding this international and transnational phenomena (e.g. experiences, occurrences and facts), but they all must be considered vital to encompass 'unbiased' equality (Held 1995).



Held states that democratic theory proves once and for all, a conflict entrenched over whether democracy should mean a particular type of popular power such other forms of politics where citizens are engaged in a self-government and self-regulation or by aid to all decision-making (a means of conferring authority on those periodically voted into office). And, Held offers to us the fact that this type of conflict only entertains three basic variants or models of democracy. The first being a direct/participatory democracy, whereby a system of decision-making about public affairs where all citizens are directly involved. The second is a Liberal/representative democracy; this system of rule embraces elected officers that accept the interests and the representation of the opinions by the citizens within their regulated territories upholding 'rule of law'. At last it becomes a one-party democracy (Marxism), a system by where the state is an extension of its own civil society, reinforcing all social order for the enhancement of particular interests (Held 1995).

The system in the first modeled illustrated by Held considers on a more common base of Athenian democracy. Although research has revealed only a few key, but abstract and institutional political innovations, most can be traced back in time to older civilizations in the East. Nevertheless, political ideals (trends) of the Athens considered slaves and women not being equal to all other citizens. Held believes that it's all because of Liberty. He claims, just like respect is for the law and justice, both have been integral to Western political thinking. He states that Athens would be a useful starting point for the assist in and of evolution, for the Athenian city-state did not differentiate between state and

society because their citizen's governors ruled a given state that was a priority over the common individual citizenry (Held 1995).

Held vies that Classical republicanism in the early Renaissance re-conceptualized Greek democratic thought by noting that civic virtue was highly fragile and particularly subject to corruption if society was dependent solely upon the political association of one of the major groups (people, nobility, or the monarchy). Held states that primary classical republicanism was dependent upon freedom of political community by resting upon its accountability to no authority other than that of the community. The knowing that self-government and the right of citizens to participate within a constitutional framework created the all-important distinct roles for leading the social forces (Held 1995).

Held tells us that both Classical republicanism and Greek democratic (autonomous) citizens were believed to be a person who gave judgment in office and participated in public affairs. Noting the difficulties locating this type of citizen in modern democracies, except perhaps representatives or office holders, it's hard imagining this type of democracy in industrial societies at the obvious levels of extraordinary social, political, and economic modification. Now the source of authority and wisdom has shifted to representatives by way of the citizen's active judgment (election) and is essentially displaced by a new following called evolution (Held 1995).

## **ii. Government**

Government is political authority; it is the executive, judicial, and legislative branches, which have their specific functions (duties) in the maintenance and progression of an

American constitutional government. As described by the United States, a requirement for government to regulate behavior and enforce order within its territory for the betterment of the general welfare, morals, health, and safety of its inhabitants. Under the 10th Amendment, the United States Constitution prohibits powers that are not delegated to the Federal Government, but are reserved to the states by the people, and respectively implies that states do not possess all possible powers since some of these powers are reserved to the people (Merriam Webster 2010).

Although there are many names for a government such as a dictatorship, monarchy, democracy, oligarchy, republic, theocracy, anarchy, aristocracy and socialism in the world, in the article known as ‘A Summary of Constitutional Rights, Powers and Duties’ by the Constitutional Society. The discussions of rights are sometimes confused concerning what is and what are not rights of the people or the powers given to government including the required duties of each. In an attempt to summarize the rights, powers, and duties as recognized or established in the U.S. Constitution, Common Law existed at the time the U.S. Constitution was adopted or as was implied. The inclusions are certain and the internal rights and powers that concern the various elements of government within each level with respect to each other must always consider the people (Constitutional Society 2010).

The Constitutional Society states “Persons are one of the two main classes which are subject to rights, powers, and duties, and the other being “citizens”. Persons may be “natural” or “corporate”; “Citizens” are the subclass of “natural persons”. Only “persons” have a standing as parties under due process, therefore each government has the power to

define what is or is not a “person” within its jurisdiction. Subject to certain restrictions of Common Law and the Constitution, the 15th Amendment requires this does not exclude anyone based on race, color, or previous condition of subjugation, etc. (Constitutional Society 2010).

### **iii. Levels of Power**

There are many levels of powers delegated to U.S. (National) Government, including exclusive powers that would arrange and collect import duties, to pay the debts of the U.S. Government, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, regulate commerce and immigration among the States, to establish a uniform rule of naturalization and to establish uniform laws on bankruptcy throughout the United States (Constitutional Society 2010).

First, the mentioning of Pre-emptive but non-exclusive powers such as providing for common defense and general welfare are to provide for calling forth Militia to execute laws, to suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and advising the times, places and manner of holding elections for members of Congress except the places for electing senators and to conduct a census every ten years (Constitutional Society 2010).

Another set of powers are the Non-pre-emptive non-exclusive powers such as 1) To arrange and collect excise taxes on commerce or income taxes on persons and 2) To borrow money. There are also certain Restrictions of the powers of our national Government too such as no exercise of powers that are not delegated by the Constitution,

and no payment from the treasury except under appropriations made by law. These excises and duties must be uniform throughout the United States and shall not pass a tax or duty on articles exported from any state (Constitutional Society 2010).

Some powers are strictly delegated to State Governments called exclusive powers. They are to appoint persons to fill vacancies in the U.S. Congress from each state by holding special elections to replace them. State executives may make temporary appointments if state legislature is in recess until they reconvene or shall appoint a temporary replacement. To appoint the officers of its Militia, to conduct the training of its Militia, and again the States non-exclusive powers are only to prescribe the times, places and manner of holding elections for members of Congress (Constitutional Society 2010).

There are restrictions of the powers of the State Governments. The first being that the State constitutions and laws may not conflict with any provision of the U.S. Constitution or any United States laws pursuant to it. They may not exercise powers that are not delegated to the State government by the State Constitution. And, may not make anything but gold or silver coin a tender in payment of debts or pass any laws impairing the obligation of contracts (Constitutional Society 2010).

A few examples of Duties of the State Governments listed by the Constitutional Society are set here forth: 1) Must provide a form of government to their citizens 2) Must conduct honest and fair elections, by secret ballot 3) Must give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and official proceedings of every other state by recognizing the privileges and immunities granted thereby (Constitutional Society 2010).

#### **iv. Centralized and Decentralized Government**

A centralized government as Defined by Merriam Webster, the United States is a federal constitutional republic, in which the President of the United States who is (Chief) and the head of the state, government, of Congress, and judiciary share powers reserved to the national government, and the federal government shares sovereignty with the state governments. All federal and state elections generally take place within a two-party system, although this is not enshrined in law the division is just that (Merriam Webster 2010).

The executive branch being headed by the President is independent of the legislature. All legislative power is vested within the two chambers of Congress, which are the Senate and the House. The judicial or judiciary branch being composed of the Supreme Court and lower federal courts that exercises judicial power. Our judiciary's function is the interpretation of the United States Constitution, and its ever-binding federal laws and regulations. This includes disputes being resolved between both the executive and legislative branches. The federal government's layout of this explained in the Constitution and the two parties (e.g. Democratic and Republican) have dominated American politics since that American Civil War although other parties have also existed none have succeeded over the well know two party system (World Wide 2010).

We find that there are major differences between the political system of the United States and that of other developed democracies in other countries. The inclusion of an increased power of the upper house of the legislature has the wider scope of power held by the Supreme Court, the separation of powers between the legislature and the executive

branch and the dominance of only the partaking of the two main political parties. The United States is one of the worlds only developed democracies where third parties have the least political influence (World Wide 2010).

A federal entity that was created by the Constitution is the dominant feature of our American governmental system. Although some people are subject to the state government, all are subject to various units of local government as well. The latter of these two include counties, municipalities, and special districts. This multiplicity of jurisdictions reflects our country's history. The federal government was created by the states and as the colonies were established separately governing themselves independently of the others, units of local government were created to efficiently carry out various state functions of the country with expansion admitting new states, which modeled on the existing ones (World Wide 2010).

A decentralized government is the process of dispersing decision-making governance closer to citizens of society. It includes the dispersal of administration or governance in many sectors by areas like engineering, management science, political science, political economy, sociology and economics. The decentralization is made possible by the dispersal of population and employment. Law, science and technological advancements all lead to a highly decentralize human endeavor. While frequently left undefined, a decentralized government has also been assigned many different meanings that vary across countries, languages, general contexts and fields of research, specific scholars and studies (World Wide 2010).

A central theme in a decentralized government is the difference between hierarchies, based on its authority. So it's just the two players in an unequal, all-powerful relationship with an interface. The horizontal relationship is between two players of roughly equal power. The more a system is decentralized, the more it relies on these lateral relationships, the less it can rely on command or force. In most branches of engineering and economics, decentralization government has been narrowly defined as the study of markets and interfaces between parts of a political system. This is most highly developed in general systems theory and neoclassical political economies (World Wide 2010).

## **G. Interest Groups**

### **1. Political Parties**

Political parties are political organizations that characteristically seek to influence government policy, usually by nominating their own candidates and trying to organize and acquire by exercising political power. Formal political parties formed in Europe and the United States back in the 19th century. A mass of the political parties plea for support from all the electorates aiming to charm the active elite, as parties develop political programs defining their ideologies proposing agendas they would pursue should they be elected into office or gain power through extra congressional means. Most countries are known to have a single-party, two-party, or multiparty systems. In the United States party candidates are ordinarily selected through a process of primary elections at the state level (Encyclopedia Britannica 2012).



### **i. Partisan**

Interest groups are a group of people who act or work together in support of a cause or purpose that share the same interest in something such as subject of study. The Partisan supporter is usually biased and a strong supporter of personal interest (self interest), and sometimes having a group interest for a specific reason. Partisan's can be most identified and are particularly known for being the types of individuals amongst a group who do not listen to other people's opinions (Lane 1992).

Lane tells us that the history of the police for example was first substance of this kind of controversy that mostly involved class and politics. A very familiar topic throughout academe, when the particulars of any interest in cause, reason, research or study become misunderstood, the reconstruction of the many topics and the outcome of interest will eventually be recognized in a number ways after the effect by most historians and laymen because at the current, the study of crime even, nonetheless, is much more difficult as is politics. Some of the difficulties here result from the ideologies and political differences that make even the definition problematic. Problematic, not only of the nineteenth, the late twentieth, but also in the twenty-first century to come, and making the concern thereof vast. Lane says, it is often very difficult with different (white-collar) crimes, and in neither period were there a consensus of morality or priorities to determine the extent of the problem. Though not now, due to the difficulties of finding natural solutions about the relative extent of these various offenses, then and now by politicians, nor can they be answered by social science scholars until we can increasingly grow aware of the holes in our historic records, which is key (Lane 1992).

## **ii. Bipartisan**

The meaning of Bipartisan is a two-party system. A Bipartisan system refers to any bill, act, resolution, or any other action by a political body where both of the major political parties are in agreement.

In one article written by Anthony Gregory, he compares ‘Bipartisan’, to that of the event of Waco, Texas for example of being the greatest of significance that concerned all issues of politics and observations. Anthony says that there are illustrations of the violent nature of the state lending the fact that political power flows from the barrel end of a gun. The truth is frightening when you consider the United States government is ultimately no different in respect to all others in this aspect. While there are many people, to include libertarians, who would just as soon forget the disaster, but we must remember history sets the course (Anthony 2006).

Anthony tells us that in 1997 the federal government of the United States ended its dispute with a group of peaceful religious separatists. The conflict began when it was initiated when the government drove a tank through the Branch Davidians’ church and home spraying poisonous gas throughout the structure keeping the fire engines at bay while the people inside and structure burned down (Anthony 2006).

Anthony speaks for many Americans when he speaks of Waco being represented by the nightmare of what their government had become. Anthony states, “Back in those days, it was the right wing that spoke out against unchecked government power, erosions of the Bill of Rights, and the imperial executive” (Anthony 2006). Anthony also says there was

so much criticism then that tempered in a form of radicalism over the next decade and for many reasons on the largest scale that ensued after the Oklahoman City bombing. This transpiration, only two years later to the date of Waco, and claims this is the event that saved Clinton's presidency from the masses becoming cautious of government power because the partisans were successful in blaming the terrorist attack on anti-governmental attitudes instead, and although we the people were made to believe the slightest bit of criticism towards the government was not patriotic. In final, the public was made aware on the typical conservative radio that Clinton was aiding the terrorists the entire time (Anthony 2006).

Recently, Anthony articulates on a former discussion (debate) he had a year ago he now mentions in his article, Waco, Oklahoma City, and the Post-9/11 Left-Right Dynamics. Anthony tells us how vividly he remembers saying, "Having seen a similar trend leading in the opposite direction, with the rightwing siding with the omnipotent state while accusing the leftwing of siding with those who want to destroy America, yet Waco is neither a leftwing nor a rightwing issue, but instead its and issue that goes beyond the greatest extent or degree of political categories profoundly cutting many questions as to what kind of country America really is, what kind it should be, and the very meanings of liberty and tyranny" (Anthony 2006).

Against all political tyranny, Anthony says, "The primary concern for a free society is not which kind of people should have their freedom smashed, but having a real concern that such freedom and liberty is for all and the capacity of the state dividing peaceful people into groups turning them against one another is its capacity to oppress" (Anthony 2006).

Whether weak to strong, rich to poor, it's the same game. Anthony finishes by saying, "Anyone can be victimized by the state so for all that believeth in the love of the many universal values of freedom as well as the finer principles on which that, America was founded on by the attainment of real moral obligations in opposition of " (Anthony 2006).

Anthony simply puts it in latent terms, "The worst of the problems of a bipartisan state is that it is viewed in the sense that if they did it, then why can't we do it. This is because it is the true form of the argument" (Anthony 2006). And, Anthony believes this is nothing more than written representations, just infinite lines of argument that come from those who honestly have criticized our presidency over the last twenty years. It is a feeling of despair while believing the whole political game is fixed. By and with concern, the conveyance of this message is simple; the bipartisan system is more like the remnants of Waco. It should remind us, Democrats are no more restrained than Republicans when it comes to being tough on political issues. This involves a bludgeoned state of power against all social elements including even ruling classes that are deemed less than human. Anthony insists this all should so remind us that bludgeoning is no more surgically precise nor compassionate no matter who may exercise such power regardless of corruption, it is for those who do wield the power to do so (Anthony 2006).

In closing Anthony states, "If ever Americans are to have their rightful liberty, the emergence of political realignment should annihilate the dishonest and this distraction constructs the left and right, both Democrat and Republican, and the focus instead is on liberty versus the state. And, if you ask a liberal you would get the impression or the

indication of a leniency towards liberty or statist. By asking a conservative about Iraq you might even provide similar illumination, but the atrocity apologists on left and right should be seen as being on the same side of the general issue of absolute power” (Anthony 2006).

## **H. Leadership**

The definition of Leadership is the office or position of a leader and having the capacity to lead. In a piece written by Professor John Rouse, “What is Charisma”, from The Political Science Department at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, tells how “charisma” is not the objective assessment by followers of their leader’s ability to meet such followers’ specific needs. Rouse says, “It is a means by which people abdicate responsibility for several consistent, tough-minded evaluations of the outcome of specific policies” (Rouse J. 2004).

Rouse claims that Citizens entrust in their leader(s), and somehow they will take care of situations that arise. A politician who lacks leadership does not have the capacity to lead. The United States at all times should exercise strong leadership. Rouse believes a required amount of psychological distance between leader and follower is a must. Rouse states, “Immediate superiors exist in the work-a-day world of constant objective feedback and evaluation, and this day-to-day intimacy destroys the illusion of leadership” (Rouse J. 2004).

Rouse states, “Charismatic leaders are sufficiently distant from ordinary folks. A simplified and magical image, or both is possible, but that it is the adherents and

opponents react emotionally to charismatic personalities, the portrait of the leader is global, and it never discriminates” (Rouse J. 2004). Rouse claims that specific weaknesses are overlooked for a great leader, as was in the life and death of former President Ronald Reagan when large numbers of people became charisma hungry. He also says that the real reason for this is the pressing need by society that occurs from historical conditions where religion wanes. Rouse claims, “Fear, anxiety, and existential dread felt by society can result in the emergence of charismatic leaders” (Rouse J. 2004).

Rouse says that war, globalization, unemployment, demise of family, church, and civility bring on feelings of fear and apprehension to most. The conditions of fear produce continuing symptoms of anxiety where citizenry distresses result in existential dread. People experience circumstances in which the rituals of their human existence become significantly impaired believing in simplicity and magical images of charismatic leadership (Rouse J. 2004). Holding nothing back, Rouse verbalizes the situation by saying, “The charismatic leader, under such conditions, may offer meaning and provide followers with a greater sense of community, but in offering salvation from fear, anxiety, and existential dread, the charismatic leader creates new forms of safety, identity, and rituals” (Rouse J. 2004). He articulates that people become dependent on the coupon and vie for any charismatic leader who is leading society in his direction, as if the leader has the lost piece to the puzzle, the answer to the crisis. And Rouse claims, “ A crisis is important to the emergence of any charismatic leadership because the charismatic leader, by virtue of unusual personal qualities, promises hope of salvation” (Rouse J. 2004).

“A German sociologist, named Max Weber”, says, Rouse, “Is the original guru on charisma, for Weber analyzed the functions and exercise of power” (Rouse J. 2004).

First, by all means the laws and traditional taboos of the particular culture or society need to be bypassed, abolished, or otherwise overcome. Rouse believes that laws, rules, regulations, customs, mores, taboos, routines, and certain ascribed standards must be circumvented allowing change. Such traits are considered though to be rational most firmly grounded in prescribed ways of acting and behaving (Rouse J. 2004).

Rouse tells us that Weber identified charisma and individual leadership as being largely emotional. Referred to as the cult of personality by Weber, Rouse in agreement with Weber says that charisma is thought to be irrational. Rouse says, “Its the charismatic personality that goes against the grain of how issues should confront the organization or country should be handled, dealt with, brokered, and accepted” (Rouse J. 2004). The people, citizens, employees, followers, and believers by the masses must carry out the new edicts, laws, and policies of the organization, or government. He says that there is a new rationality established on the recent establishment cult of personality. Rouse states, “The followers want to be persuaded, not coerced, into implementing dictates of the new realities” (Rouse J. 2004).

Rouse declares that charisma is not merely the appearance of such dynamics excited, motivated, committed, or of a passion-filled person. It is the charismatic person that persuades followers to change their old ways of responding to the new country’s challenges and problems. Citizens just as followers are to act in a creative, determined,

sustained, and must find new ways to accomplish tasks assigned to the “wars” of the charismatic leader (Rouse J. 2004).

Rouse, like many other people, at times there are great men and women who arrive on the scene or come from the ranks of common people, but the charismatic leader can and will dominate decision making regardless of the logic of his or her position while followers abandon rational thinking and start following the new leader (e.g. Pied Piper) into an unknown future of promise. Rouse announces, “In democracies, however, followers are often educated and not easily seduced” (Rouse J. 2004)

In review of an article once read in relation to Rouse, Jay Harsin, author of *The Lost Histories of American Economic Rights* examines the concept of autonomy and the discontinuous historical usage of the term ‘economic rights’ in American political discourse from the perspective of democratic political freedom leadership claims that It views ideas and many ideologies of ‘economic rights’ as a discursive marker pointing to historically contingent relations between government, national economy and individual freedom. This allows those in leadership having power will lead followers (Harsin 2010).

Harsin focuses on the only two American presidential powers concerning Economic Bill of Rights and a combination of such circumstances of said adversarial differences. Harsin mentions only Franklin Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan in articulation having charismatic character and by representation of the two opposing political traditions of economic rights in the United States with the first being neo-liberal laissez-faire free market tradition, and secondly the liberal welfare-state of tradition (Harsin 2010).



Harsin demonstrates that by having power in leadership, economic rights to the people can be hindered by charismatic leadership, having followers who believed only to finding that the answer of change was in another direction. Harsin's example was Franklin D. Roosevelt and a presidential speech which later was redefined by Ronald Reagan by seconding considerations to move toward a hypothetical analysis of the New Deal and the Reagan Revolution, By all charismatic leadership both of these liberal traditions were haunted by an older democratic-republican discourse upon the economic rights of the people from which they continued to draw normative and affective vigor without ever confronting its guiding premises (Harsin 2010).

Harsin claims this is the very reason contemporary popular discourse about the economic crisis continues to demonstrate a continuation of deeply entrenched historical out-of-date understandings of the promise and possibilities of individual autonomy (the freedom) within the folds of a society and government that is completely transformed by capitalist modernity, and by giving reason for reflections of our history that reveal the current autonomy breakdown fuelling possible resources against such political struggles of the masses (Harsin 2010).

Harsin argues this very concept and says, "By being useful upon critical analysis of the present conjuncture that pertains to and amongst all political struggles concerning autonomy, leadership, and power, the approaches by definition throughout its use in the all American political life has been driven to a conceptual charismatic comparison while usage in other contexts are not conceptually derived exclusively from the typical global human rights dialogue" (Harsin 2010).

The authors of *With Strings Attached- Statutory Delegations of Authority to the Executive Branch*, both make this statement when it comes to the executive branch powers and autonomous decision making, they both claim that while researching the influence of a divided government by legislative outputs are available. Relatively though, little identifies the effects of a divided government on a legislative control of bureaucratic discretion. Some might even suggest that inter-branch conflict between the President and Congress only leads legislators to seek to retain legislative control over the bureaucracy. And so, as a result, periods of a divided government increase statutory control and reduce agency autonomy” (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

#### **1. A Republican Government led by Ronald Reagan (1981 - 1989):**

Concurrent with Rouse, Harsin, Taratoot and Nixon’s literature a continuation of having A Republican Government led by Ronald Reagan from 1981 to 1989 seems similarly charismatic of autonomy, leadership and by having followers. A most definite continuation of the intense rooted historical out-of-date indulgences of the promise and possibilities of individual autonomy (the freedom) to decide with consequences in all creases of the world by the people completely transformed by government charismatic behaviors to become followers. And by this all allowing citizens all the more reason to reflect upon history in order to reveal the current autonomous breakdown of government in faith of fuelling possible resources against such political struggles by the ranks that trickle down upon the commonwealth or its people.

Preparatory to the major changes made by President Reagan alongside members of 111<sup>th</sup> and 112<sup>th</sup> congress that restricted student’s benefits for college, eligibility changes for all

unknowing young widows/widowers, divorced widows/widowers, wives and husbands that effected many fatherless children. Modifying the rules of government pension offsets while increasing full retirement age, counting part of social security benefits as taxable income, then restricting the eligibility to lump sum death payments to survivors of the deceased, but from 1981 to 1989 Reagan led his Republican Government to many changes by their decisions, choices, and the consequences were served. Here we will cover many other topics detailing the political autonomous charismatic behavior by this contentious government.

**i. Deprivation of the Lowly:**

Dreier writes of Reagan's Legacy: Homelessness in America, and Dreier recalls that the two-term president wasn't known as the peoples friend, nor was he concerned for the poor or the cities they lived in. After Regan became president in 1981, he mandated a reduction in federal spending. The reality of it was in fact he actually boosted it through an escalating military budget, while he was cutting funds for domestic programs that aided the American workers, particularly the poor (Dreier 2004).

Dreier tells us that Reagan's fans (followers) gave him credit for restoring the nation's wealth, "But, whatever economic growth had occurred during the Reagan years only benefited those already well off because the income gap between the rich and everyone else in America widened" (Dreier 2004) Dreier also says, "It was then that the average workers wages weakened as our nations homeownership rates dropped, and proposes that during Reagan's two terms in the White House, which was at very beneficial times for the rich, and then poverty rates across our country escalated even more" (Dreier 2004).

Dreier writes that it is legendary of Reagan's notorious character displayed inconsiderate autonomous behavior towards inner-city problems. A main concern for major supporters of urban cities knew Reagan did not feel indebted to their voters, the bigger city mayor's, black or Hispanic leaders, or for labor unions. But, during a White House reception early into his presidency Reagan did however greet the only black member of his Cabinet, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Secretary Samuel Pierce, as he asked, "How are you, Mr. Mayor, I'm glad to meet you and how are things in your city?" Dreier says, "This exact response to his HUD Secretary, Samuel Pierce that proved Reagan had no real concerns with the rising corruption within the agency" (Dreier 2004). Dreier then says, "It was a scandal, and only subsequently thereafter Reagan's top administration officials were eventually charged and convicted for illegally targeting housing subsidies to politically connected developers. "It was the HUD Scandal", says Dreier, "that was not uncovered until Reagan's presidency had ended" (Dreier 2004).

Dreier also claimed, "Presiding over the intense deregulation of the nation's savings and loan industry allowing S&Ls to end their reliance on home mortgages and engage in an overindulgence of commercial real estate rumor, Reagan's result was prevalent corruption, negligence and the bankruptcy of hundreds of frugal organizations that eventually directed a taxpayer bailout that cost hundreds of billions of dollars" (Dreier 2004)

In the 1980s the inescapable racial discrimination by banks, real estate agents and landlords, that were unmonitored by Reagan's administration, HUD and justice departments violated the Community Reinvestment Act, which prohibits racial

discrimination in lending where public groups eventually uncovered the obvious redlining by those same banks using federal Home Mortgage Disclosure Act information. Unable to prosecute or sanction denied 40,000 applications from banks requesting permission to expand their operations. Dreier declares, but it was Reagan's bank regulators that denied only eight of them on the grounds of violating CRA regulations (Dreier 2004)

Dreier also says that by the end of Reagan's term in office federal assistance to local governments was cut 60 percent. Dreier also states, "Reagan had eliminated general revenue sharing to cities, slashed funding for public service jobs and job training, and almost dismantled federally funded legal services for the poor, cutting the anti-poverty Community Development Block Grant program while reducing funds for public transit. And, "The only 'urban program' that survived", says Dreier, "was the cuts was federal aid for highways by which primarily benefited the suburbs, not the cities" (Dreier 2004)

Dreier claims that these cutbacks were catastrophic and consequential on cities with high levels of poverty and restricted property taxes and mostly to those dependent on federal aid. In 1980 federal dollars accounted for 22 percent of the larger city budgets. Dreier says, the fact is, at the end of Reagan's second term, federal aid was only 6 percent. "The consequences were devastating to urban schools, libraries, municipal hospitals and clinics alike, sanitation, police and fire departments", says Dreier, "by Reagan stopping services to their communities" (Dreier 2004)

Dreier says that Reagan was always acclaimed as being the great communicator, and sometimes Reagan even used his rhetorical skills to stigmatize the poor and throughout

his perplexed speeches, Reagan did dutifully promise to cut welfare. Habitually, over and over, Reagan told the story of a so-called “welfare queen” from Chicago who drove a Cadillac and had embezzled \$150,000 from the government using 80 aliases, 30 addresses, a dozen social security numbers and with four fictional dead husbands. Media alike investigated the notorious “welfare queen” whereabouts in hopes of interviewing her but had discovered she didn’t exist. “The imagery ‘welfare cheats’ that persists to this very damn day” says Dreier, “has helped lay the groundwork for the all well known 1996 welfare reform law, pushed by the Republicans and signed by President Clinton” (Dreier 2004)

Concerning domestic spending the most histrionic cuts by Reagan was for low-income housing subsidies. By selection a housing task force dominated by politically connected developers, landlords and bankers in 1982 confirmed a report that called for free and deregulated markets as the alternative to government assistance. Instruction Reagan followed and in his first year in office reduced the budget for public housing and Section 8 to about \$17.5 billion, seeking to eliminate federal housing assistance to the poor altogether in the next two years (Dreier 2004)

It was during Reagan’s administration in the 1980’s that the proportion of the eligible poor receiving federal housing subsidies declined. In 1970 there were only 300,000 low-cost rental units that totaled nearly 7 million, but were more than the low-income renter households that had totaled about 6 and half million. It was by 1985 though that the total number of these low-cost housing units fell to 5.6 million, and the number of more than

low-income renter households grew to 8.9 million, a whopping lack of equality (disparity) that totaled 3.3 million household units (Dreier 2004)

Dreier tells his readers of even another living legacy during Reagan's time as President. It was the escalating number of homeless people, and by the late 1980s the homeless figures grew to 600,000 rising each day to a whopping 1.2 million continuing into the year after. "Many of these homeless were Vietnam veterans, children and laid-off workers" Says Dreier (Dreier 2004)

Then in 1984 on Good Morning America, Dreier states that Reagan defended himself against accusations of being heartless towards the poor after his all-classic blaming-the-victim statement. Reagan once made a public statement that the people who were sleeping on the grate of the homeless are the homeless and one could say they are homeless by choice. What a statement (Dreier 2004).

Dreier says that many residential groups, community development corporations and community organizations struggled to minimize the unscrupulous damage by Reagan's cutbacks. Dreier also states that there were some very important victories after Clinton won office. First there was the expansion of Earned Income Tax Credit, stronger enforcements for CRA. Funding for low-income housing, legal services, job training and other programs since have never been restored to pre-Reagan levels, so the widening disparities between the rich and the rest persist (Dreier 2004).

In final Dreier claims that President George W. Bush often claims Reagan's role while proposing cutting one-third of the Section 8 housing vouchers. Section 8 housing

vouchers were sustenance to the homelessness for two million poor families. It was after naming a major airport, schools and streets after Ronald Reagan, which became a fitting tribute to his legacy. But, Dreier then says, “Wouldn’t it be even more a fitting tribute for each American city to name at least one park bench, whereby at least one homeless person is allowed to sleep every night to honor our 40th president” (Dreier 2004).

**ii. Middle Class Elimination:**

Reganomics was the trickle down effect, but what trickled down and on whom? The answer might just be the one that retired U.S.A.F Lieutenant Colonial named Robert Bowman writes exactly on the divisions of middleclass vs. poor, of its elimination and tells us that Advocates of social justice are often accused of engaging in class warfare. If you were to ask Bowman he’d only say, “The real truth is a class warfare that is indeed being waged, but not by us. Bowman admits the wager against us, is indeed against 90% of the people in the U.S and by the wealthy few, the corporate owners, the bondholders, and the oligarchy” (Bowman 2011).

Dr. Bowman tells us that The Reagan revolution was a major war, and we (the people) lost. We lost the war on poverty that became the war on the poor, then and on the middle class too. Bowman says that the worst of was that the working people didn’t even understand that they were being attacked, plundered, chewed up and spit out by our own government (Bowman 2011).

Dr. Bowman, if I might add, opts to out the beginning of the Reagan era, telling us that the richest one percent of Americans owned a little under 20% of the country’s assets



during Reagan's administration. At the current, Americans now own well over 40%. As a society being told there are very few rich people, if you could only spread their wealth, it wouldn't make any difference (except to them). What a colossal, deceitful lie!" Says Bowman, and "If the wealth of this country were equally divided amongst us all, every American family would get over a quarter of a million dollars (Bowman 2011).

By Bowman's theory and personal experience, he claims that daily the rich get richer; the poor continue to get poorer. And, throughout 1980, total salaries of at least earning a million dollars or more a year grew even larger averaging up to 243% per year. This was nothing more than the typical corporate CEO that today generates about four million dollars a year, about three-fourths mostly in stock options and the rest in tax-sheltered compensation. And all the while, the poor and middle class just keep on getting worse as poverty escalates (Bowman 2011).

It makes sense Bowman would advise us that income levels have declined since the 1960s, an accelerating trend that continues to prosper. Pending the 1980's the war on poverty was sluggishly being won as the number of families in poverty was declining. But then Reagan's revolution altered it, making a fraction of our people who lived in poverty only increase rapidly, and especially for our children and the minorities.

Vindictive to the facts that productivity had risen intensely, and based on productivity gains, we all ought to be working ten hours a week, and yet enjoy the same standard of living we had in the 1950s and obviously, not a reality at the current (Bowman 2011).

Bowman says, back in 1952, the average factory worker had to work one day in order to earn just simple closing costs for a brand new home. Then In 1991, it took the average

factory worker, if lucky enough to have a job about 126 days to earn the closing costs on the same (now 40-year old) home. What's even worse, now the average factory worker, regardless of seniority and retail workers alike don't even earn enough to qualify for a mortgage on that 40-year old tract house. The realities are home ownership is diminishing, as the American dream is rapidly becoming a nightmare for our younger generation. Assets owned, minus a persons liabilities or net worth if preferred, of the averaged median non-home owner American family today is just about three thousand dollars. And, so this is middle class, more like the poor (Bowman 2011).

Bowman asks his readers if they understand how this all this happened, he questions the divisions of both the rich and poor in the U.S. and how it become the worst in the world, even worse than Mexico or Brazil. But, Bowman is adamant when he insists the answer is power; saying power has always been the ultimate answer to many other similar questions in doubt as well. He claims these giant multinational corporations have become more powerful than any other government. Undeniably they dictate the policies of many governments. As they continue to dominate most political parties including both major parties in the U.S., and by owning the major media, it only allows them to mold most public opinion and manipulate the people. Bowman does not address all of the ultimate answers to the many questions of those of the United States, but dealing along the lines of specific mechanisms used to propel money from all levels of society up to their own and by these three mechanisms by wages, debt, and taxes (Bowman 2011).

### **iii. Absolute Reaganomics:**

Once a member of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisers (1981-1985), William A. Niskanen (Chairman of the Cato Institute), is the author of 'Reganomics'. As a writer, notable and conclusive, but objective gives his account of administration economic policies during Reagan. Niskanen tells us that 'Reaganomics' altered the course of the U.S. economic policy more than any other administration since the New Deal (Niskanen 1988).

Niskanen says that Reagan believed that by reducing Government only then could we as a nation increase the growth of our economy. In 1981 Reagan's Program for Economic Recovery had four major policy objectives. The first was to reduce the growth of government spending, the second was to reduce marginal tax rates on income from both capital and labor, thirdly to reduce regulation, and the last was to reduce inflation by controlling the growth of the money supply. Niskanen claims that these major policy changes, in turn, were from the start expected to increase saving and investment, to increase our economic growth, supposedly balance the U.S. budget, restore healthier financial markets and reduce inflation and interest rates but did not (Niskanen 1988).

By evaluation, Reagan's economic program consequently addresses two general questions. 'One of which', says Niskanen, "Of the proposed policy changes, how many were approved and how much of the predicted economic effects were understood?" (Niskanen 1988) Niskanen insists, "The issue of Reaganomics continues to be a controversial topic, and for those who do not view Reaganomics through an ideological

lens, however, ones evaluation of the vast major changes in economic policy will depend on the balance of the realized economic effects” (Niskanen 1988).

Niskanen comments that President Reagan did deliver on four of his major policy objectives, but not to the extent that he and his supporters desired. During the Carter administration, a decline from 4.0 to 2.5 percent, but during Reagan’s administration there were annual increases in real (inflation-adjusted) despite the record peacetime increase in real defense spending. Part of Reagan’s fiscal record only mirrored the restraint; it was not a turnaround of any previous fiscal trends. Niskanen claims, “Reagan made no noteworthy changes to the major transfer payment programs (such as Social Security and Medicare), proposing no substantial reductions in other domestic programs after his first budget (Niskanen 1988).

The overall growth of funds for defense spending during Reagans first term was higher than early proposed during his 1980 campaign, meanwhile economic growth was slightly slower than expected. Reagan alternatively failed at significantly reducing federal spending percent per capita of national output. Niskanen says, that Federal spending was at 22.9 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) in fiscal 1981, then it somewhat increased throughout the years of Reagan’s administration. Federal spending declined later to 22.1 percent of GDP in fiscal 1989, most assured this was one of the greatest disappointments to all Reagan’s supporters (followers) (Niskanen 1988).

Reagan made changes to the federal tax code and noticeably substantial. He reduced the top marginal tax rate on individual income from 70 percent to 28 percent; also reduced corporate income tax rates from 48 percent to 34 percent. Individual tax brackets were

indexed for inflation nearly exempting all poor from the individual income tax. And, by these measures a slight offset by several tax increases. Reagan also increased Social Security tax rates; previously legislated in 1977 and scheduled for the eighties they accelerated somewhat. On other terms excise tax rates were increased, and some deductions were reduced or likely eliminated (Niskanen 1988).

Niskanen claims that the most important was a major reversal in the tax treatment of business income. And Niskanen declares, “A complex package of investment incentives was approved in 1981 only to be gradually reduced in each subsequent year through 1985, and in 1986 the base for the taxation of business income was substantially broadened, reducing the tax bias among categories of investment by increasing the average effective tax rate on new investments” (Niskanen, 1988). He believes it wasn’t clear whether this degree of change introduced a net improvement overall in the tax code. When we consider everything, calculations of these two combinations, lower tax rates with a broader tax base for both individuals and businesses had reduced the federal revenue share of GDP dropped from 20.2 percent 1981 to 19.2 percent in 1989 (Niskanen 1988).

From Carter’s reductions in economic regulations, continued throughout Reagan’s administration the same, but at a slower rate. Niskanen says, “Reagan eased or eliminated price controls on oil and natural gas, cable TV, long-distance telephone service, interstate bus service, and ocean shipping. Even the banks were allowed to invest somewhat in a wider ranged set of assets because the scope of the antitrust laws were reduced” (Niskanen, 1988). The keys allowance to this design was substantially

increasing import barriers. Niskanen articulates, “The Reagan administration did not propose changes such legislation affecting health, safety, or the environment, but did reduce the number of new regulations under the existing laws” (Niskanen, 1988). And, it is a fact that deregulation was obviously not on the top of list of priorities of essentials in Reagan’s economic program (Niskanen 1988).

Reagan’s administration had quite the inconsistent monetary policy but remained fairly effective. Niskanen states that Reagan endorsed a reduction in currency growth initiated by the Federal Reserve in late 1979. A policy that consequently led to the severe 1982 recession, and a large reduction in inflation and interest rates. This overturned the position on one dimension of monetary policy during the first term, but the administration never intervened in the markets foreign exchange until 1985. Only then occasionally intervening objectively to reduce and stabilize the foreign-exchange value of the American dollar (Niskanen 1988).

“Quite promising”, says Niskanen, “But the results to these policies, somewhat were only disappointing compared to predictions by the administration” (Niskanen 1988). Niskanen claims that the economies growth increased 2.8 percent annual rate during Carter’s administration, but was deceptive because high numbers of the working-age population was much slower during Reagan’s era. The actual GDP per working-age adult, which had increased annually by only 0.8 percent during the Carter administration, and increasing 1.8 percent annually during the Reagan administration (Niskanen 1988).

The increase in productivity growth was higher during the Reagan administration for output per hour in the business sector, which was also roughly constant during the Carter

administration, with an all time increase of 1.4 percent rate during Reagan's administration. Niskanen says productivity in the manufacturing sector increased at only 3.8 annual percentage rate setting a record during peacetime. But, while nearly all other economic conditions improved, unemployment rates declined from 7 percent in 1980 to 5.4 percent in 1988, inflation rates declined from almost ten and half percent in 1980 to four and half percent in 1988. There were numerous other conditions that varied, such as the rates of new business developments increased suddenly. During the Reagan administration numerous bank failures grew to be the highest since the 1930's. Real interest rates increased severely, and inflation-adjusted prices for common stocks more than doubled (Niskanen 1988).

Niskanen confirms that although the American economy had experienced substantial turbulences during Reagan's Presidency, regardless of such favorable general economic conditions, this was the Reagan's creative destruction and that this has always been characteristic of a healthy economy. And, by the end of Reagan's administration the United States economy experienced the longest peacetime expansion ever. Niskanen calls it stagflation and malaise, he says it plagued the U.S. economy from 1973 through 1980 and it happened from the autonomous effects of the transformation by the Reagan's economic program throughout a sustained period of higher growth and lower inflation" (Niskanen 1988).

By examination Reaganomics key successes were critical decreases in inflation and marginal tax rates by achieving them cheaper than previously anticipated regardless of the vast decline in marginal tax rates, for example the federal revenue share of GDP. A

slight decline likewise similarly, the huge decline in inflation rates, successful having no long-term effect on the unemployment rate. “The one reason for these feats”, claims Niskanen, “were the broad bipartisan support for these actions taken beginning in the latter years of Carter’s administration” (Niskanen 1988). Niskanen research informs us that Reagan’s first tax proposal for example, was endorsed by the Democratic Congress beginning in 1978, then the general structure of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 was first proposed by two junior Democratic members of Congress first in 1982” (Niskanen 1988).

Niskanen calls this the ‘monetarist experiment’ and says it was used to control inflation originally initiated in October 1979, following Carter’s appointment of Paul Volcker as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. It is a Bipartisan support for these policies that allowed Reagan to implement more radical changes than in any other area of economic policy. Although Reagan failed to succeed in several program goals initially, the federal budget was considerably altered from discretionary domestic spending to defense, entitlements, and interest payments (Niskanen 1988).

The federal budget share of the United States national output declined only slightly. Both Reagan’s administration and Congress were responsible for the consequences manifested by the autonomy. We learn Reagan supported the larger increases in defense spending and was unwilling to reform basic entitlement programs and Congress was unwilling to make further cuts in the discretionary domestic programs. Likewise, neither Reagan’s administration nor Congress would support the progressive development for deregulation or the improvement regulations for health, safety, or even the environment (Niskanen 1988).



The facts then as given by Niskanen claim the above enhances three more major adverse Reagan legacies by the end of his second term. First Reagan privately detained federal debt increases from 22.3 percent of GDP to over 38 percent, a record during a peacetime expansion, and the federal deficit in Reagan's last budget remained 3 percent of GDP. Secondly, Reagan's administration failed to address the savings and loan problem early, which in return led to an additional U.S. debt in the excess of \$125 billion. And lastly, Reagan's administration added additional trade barriers than any administration since Hoover. And Niskanen writes that the share of the United State imports that became subject to some form of trade restraint that was increased from 12 percent in 1980 to 23 percent in 1988 (Niskanen 1988).

Niskanen is very adamant in his works claiming that there was more than enough blame to go around all of the problems. To start with how about when Reagan resisted tax increases and Congress resisted cuts in domestic spending. The administration dawdling to acknowledge the savings and loan problems and Congress urged forbearances closing the failing banks. Reagan's pretentious words or skills with language helped strongly to support free trade, but pressure from threatened industries and Congress managed substantial increases in new trade restraints. "The future of Reaganomics", says Niskanen, "will depend largely on how each of these three adverse legacies is resolved, the limits on spending and regulation are supportive of a Reaganomics economy at current, but increasing taxes and undertaking a reregulation of domestic and foreign trade would perimeter Reaganomics to an nothing more than a stimulating and passing trial in economic policies" (Niskanen 1988).

In final Niskanen says that Reagan's economic program led to many substantial improvements in all of U.S. historical economic conditions, but it was no Reagan Revolution as he called it. He says Ronald Reagan made no major federal programs other than revenue sharing and no agencies were abolished. As the political process continues to generate demands for new or expanded programs, but the American voters continue to resist higher taxes to pay for these programs. Niskanen expresses a more serious, broader popular consensus on the appropriate roles of the federal government, even one or more constitutional amendments, and a new generation of political leaders may be necessary solely to resolve the ill inherited conflict in and of contemporary American politics (Niskanen 1988).

### **III. Case Study: Charismatic President Ronald Reagan, his administration, and the "Reaganomic" solution effect**

Ronald Reagan's hold on the American people can be further illustrated by understanding the man and his personal history. Reagan was born to John Reagan and Nellie Wilson above a general store in Tampico, Illinois, on February 6, 1911. Reagan's father gave him his lifetime nickname of "Dutch because he supposedly looked like "a fat little Dutchman", and as a child he styled the Dutch boy haircut, once popular for little boys" (University of Texas, 2012).

During the Depression, Ronald's father had to sell his shoe store. After moving to Dixon, just outside Chicago, Reagan's father benefitted directly from the President he would later emulate, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The senior Reagan gained employment as the result of the New Deal. Both Reagan and his father understandably became fervent

supporters of Franklin Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. Facts state Reagan claimed to have admired Presidents George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Calvin Coolidge (University of Texas, 2012).

Reagan reportedly attended the local public schools and enjoyed a happy childhood. By the time Reagan was 14 years old, he worked a construction job digging ditches ten hours a day, six days a week, for a wage of 35 cents per hour. A 1934 Nash Lafayette was his first car. While working several jobs Reagan saved up about \$200 for his college tuition and enrolled Eureka College in Illinois. The athletic, young Reagan won an athletic scholarship in 1928 to attend Eureka College. Although Reagan studied economics and sociology, he excelled more as a football player and swimmer making only average grades. He graduated in 1932 (University of Texas, 2012).

After Reagan left college, he was able to get a job as a sports announcer for the Davenport radio station, WOC. Later, Reagan relocated to the WHO radio station in Des Moines, Iowa. In 1933, he became one of the most admired sports commentators in the area (University of Texas, 2012).

Then the future of Reagan's life took a turn that would change his life forever. Warner Brothers signed a seven-year contract with him after a screen test forcing Reagan to move to California in 1937. At 6 foot 1, the tall man with brown hair and blue eyes weighed about 182 lbs. He was always ready to take the spotlight, and with his rosy complexion, he never had to wear makeup in any of his movies. Thankfully for Reagan, contact lenses became available to the public to take care of his near-sightedness (University of Texas, 2012).

Unfortunately, bad eyesight wasn't his only problem. After an acting incident, where a gun fired near his ear caused him significant hearing loss, he started wearing a hearing aid. To his credit, he refused to make the incident an issue, and never revealed which movie, or which actor, caused the hearing loss (University of Texas, 2012).

The University of Texas Archives states that President Reagan was always a man of action; his favorite sports were golf, horseback riding, ranch handwork, swimming, and target shooting. His love of golf would serve him well later in life when he began battling Alzheimer's disease. And, he remained an avid sports fan of major league baseball and football throughout his life (University of Texas, 2012).

Reagan's religious life also played a role in his future decisions as President. As a child he was raised in his mother's Disciples of Christ denomination. But beginning in 1963, Reagan began attending services at the Bel-Air Presbyterian Church in California, and later became an official member after leaving the Presidency. Reagan considered himself a "born-again Christian" (University of Texas, 2012).

His whirlwind entrance into government allowed Reagan to take Center Stage in a new theatre that of the very highest profile stakes, the government in California. He became Governor of the state of California and rapidly demonstrated his tendency toward reducing government spending. He introduced serious budget cuts and put a hiring freeze into effect for state agencies. Still, he was re-elected winning over half of the citizen's vote in 1970. This popularity then enabled him to introduce a series of welfare reforms. These reforms included restricting eligibility requirements for welfare aid that required people without disabilities to actively seek work rather than receive benefits. However,

additional tax cuts he promised never materialized. In fact, he presided over the largest tax increase than any other state in American history (University of Texas, 2012).

It is obvious; more would be expected for such hierarchical position. Of course Reagan's candidacy was acceptable to the masses of groups of people across the nation.

Nevertheless, minimum requirements as per our U.S. Constitution Reagan and winning the Republican Presidential nomination in 1980 and chose former Texas Congressman and United Nations Ambassador George Bush to become Vice President.

On January 20, 1981, the 69-year-old Reagan took office becoming the oldest President of the United States to be inaugurated in American history. In just 69 days of becoming President, Reagan suffered a severe injury after an assassin attempt intended to kill him, He survived with only one gunshot wound but it did puncture his lung requiring several months to fully recover. His swift recovery and return to work and the vigor he displayed shortly following the assassin attempt earned him a significant increase in popularity with the American people (White House 2012).

When Reagan took office, he faced a nation in the midst of serious inflation and an overseas crisis with 52 American hostages who had been held in Iran for a year. The immediate release of the hostages after he took office gave Reagan an instant popularity which would be a strong political advantage giving him the clout he would need to deal with Congress.

Dealing cleverly with Congress, Reagan was able to obtain the legislation his administration so desired to stimulate economic growth, curb inflation, increase

employment, and strengthen national defense. As Reagan's journey as President began, the American economy headed on a new course of cutting taxes and Government expenditures.

The new President declined to pull back the reigns when the dramatic increase in support of our defense forces created a large deficit. With a renewed sense of self-confidence, President Reagan and Vice President Bush easily won a second term in 1984 with an extraordinarily high number of electoral votes. His victory over Democratic challengers Walter F. Mondale and Geraldine Ferraro allowed Reagan to continue his course in economic tax reduction and deficit inflation. He achieved obtaining an overhaul of the income tax code (White House 2012).

The overhaul abolished several deductions in taxes so in effect the top marginal individual income tax rate fell from 70.1 percent down to 28.4 percent, as previously mentioned by William A. Niskanen, who described by this exact tax overhaul as one of the four pillars of Reagan's supply-side economic theory. "Reagan delivered on each of his four major policy objectives, although not to the extent that he and his supporters had hoped", said Niskanen, "And, all while the most substantial change was in the tax code, there was a "major reversal in the tax treatment of business income, with effect of reducing the tax bias among these types of investment but increasing the average effective tax rate on new investments" (Niskanen)

Records from the White House concerning foreign policy, tells us that Reagan's goal was to achieve "peace through strength." "He always displayed a character of willingness; he was never intimidated or ever fearful to initiate the first phase in any critical foreign

policy affair”. In his first term, Reagan met several times with Russian leader Mikhail Gorbachev, making the first major move forward in the Cold War. Reagan is credited with the eventual elimination of the Cold War when both agreed to eliminate some of their nuclear weapons (White House 2012).

But the consequences of his strength overseas meant a higher price to pay at home. Reagan’s administration increased defense spending 35 percent. During intense meetings with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev over negotiating a treaty that would eliminate intermediate-range nuclear missiles, Reagan then declared war against international terrorism, sending American bombers to strike against Libya after evidence proved Libya was involved in an attack on our American soldiers in a West Berlin nightclub (White House 2012).

By using naval escorts to protect free trade in the Persian Gulf, he maintained the circulation of oil during the Iran-Iraq War. In creating the Reagan Doctrine, he supported the anti-Communist insurgencies in Central America, Asia, and Africa. The duration of Reagan’s second term as President and his illusion of the “strength overseas” and bargaining methods commenced to unravel. In the uncovering of the Iran-Contra Affair Reagan’s image as a leader with a strong moral backbone became tarnished by the scandal when it was discovered that U.S. government weapons had been traded for the hostages when he took office in 1981. Though initially Reagan denied having any knowledge of the trade, but he later made a public apology to the American people announcing his undeniable responsible actions made by his decisions and the consequences thereof, that it had been “a mistake” (Rosenberg 2012).

The Miller Center of the University of Virginia, a nonpartisan institute pursuing the development of offering the knowledge of our presidency, policy, and political history, offers more insights into Reagan's Presidency in its "Presidential Reference" source. The Reference reports that although Reagan hoped his legacy would be reduced government influence, his excesses in federal spending and thereby increased the deficit significantly. What made matters even worse with the deficit was that he didn't compensate for the increases in spending with any significant budget cuts (The University of Virginia 2012).

Reagan resisted reducing the popular programs of Social Security and Medicare. But these programs comprised the majority of the federal budget. So he finally attempted to change the entrenched programs. Nevertheless, Congress would not approve the changes. In the end, according to his own retrospectives, Reagan was relieved. In the archives of The University of Virginia and the Miller Center facts claim, "In truth, Reagan had little interest in overturning such popular programs. Facts say Reagan made it quite clear in his diaries, released nearly two decades after his presidency, Reagan's aim was to whittle away at Lyndon Johnson's Great Society while leaving Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal largely intact" (The University of Virginia 2012).

Despite the fact that liberals didn't want these programs dismantled, there was an understanding among most politicians at the time from both parties, that the combination of Reagan's increased military spending and minimal if any budget cuts would have a most negative financial impact in the long run. The mixture of huge tax cuts, minor budget cuts, and increasing defense spending was only a recipe for unbalanced federal budgets that would result in producing a higher national debt. The response was supply-



side economics. Reagan's hopes of ultimately achieving balanced budgets by increasing the tax base and Congress would make the spending cuts that Reagan had proposed. Instead, Congress ratified as many tax cuts as possible, making a 'Layered Cake' with the budget bill. A surprise to Reagan, his Republican members of Congress layered the budget bill with pet spending projects as freely as did the adversary, the Democrats, and the end result was a ballooning federal deficit that would plague the nation until the Clinton years (The University of Virginia 2012).

While the federal deficit continued to soar, another player on the economic scene attempted to control other parts of the nation's monetary policy. Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Paul Volcker, was a Carter appointee who quickly won Reagan's confidence. As the head of the Federal Reserve, Volcker was able to act without presidential or congressional approval. He aimed to bring inflation under control by tightening the nation's money supply resulting in higher interest rates for loans. The effect of this policy, however was that it stagnated borrowing for both small businesses and middle-class Americans. Volcker defended this policy as the necessary antidote to inflation (The University of Virginia 2012).

Despite these blunders, polls revealed that voters still admired Reagan's federal tax cuts, so capitalizing on his popularity once again for only an increased political gain.

University of Virginia's archives inform us that, "Reagan provided an added incentive for the Boll Weevil Democrats in the House and he promised not to campaign against any Democrat in the 1982 mid-term election if, they voted for both of his tax and budget bills" (The University of Virginia 2012).

Reagan had won the support of Congressional Democrats enough to effectively use negotiations to allow him to subtly decrease tax cuts and restore certain proposed, pet budget projects. Congress swiftly passed related bills. With Reagan's primary economic program in place, taxes were reduced by 25 percent over three years. Although Congress made \$38 billion in budget cuts, they were later offset by the spending increases required by the President's military spending and congressional pork-barrel projects (The University of Virginia 2012).

A surprising political success for the President was his firing of striking air traffic controllers. Although PATCO was one of the few labor unions that supported him in the 1980 elections, Reagan fired those who went on strike, bringing air traffic to a grinding halt, when they resisted his 'back-to-work order'. This all-historical and vital air strike by PATCO was considered illegal for they were federal employees. Regardless of law (rule) almost 12,000 members of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO) went on strike (The University of Virginia 2012).

### **Busting PATCO's Union**

The term "Union Busting" was coined in June 1981 as a result of Reagan's win against PATCO. Workers did not accept a three-year contract for \$105 million in pay raises. Even though the raises were substantial, more than double that of other federal employees, workers insisted on also asking for shorter workweeks and earlier retirements.

But, on August 3, 1981 after no compromise, PATCO's president and other members walked off their jobs and went on strike. As federal employees the strike was considered illegal. But PATCO leaders hoped that the public would consider air traffic employees so essential for the safe operations of the air transportation system it would generate support from other unions and the public. That support never materialized (Encyclopedia 2012).

Unwavering, Reagan's administration ordered the federal employees to end the strike and return to work immediately. Reagan's administration decided to stand their ground during those tough negotiations and issued the ultimatum that the strikers must go back to work within forty-eight hours or be fired.

PATCO disobeyed this federal court order and so union leaders were fined and jailed for contempt of court. After dismissing all the federal employees from their jobs, Reagan prohibited the Federal Aviation Administration from ever rehiring them. In total over twelve thousand PATCO members lost their jobs. After many ineffective attempts to reclaim their jobs through the courts, they failed. Furthermore, PATCO was removed from being the legal bargaining agent for federal air traffic controllers in the future (Encyclopedia 2012).

While fears ran high that replacing experienced controllers would cause numerous air collisions, Reagan managed to convince some of the managerial staff, and certain trustworthy controllers, to bring in some new hire to take over. Thanks to this success, Reagan was again seen as the resilient leader who braved disapproval and made harsh decisions. The firing of the PATCO strikers is said to have sent a clear message to corporate America, and, that the message was to encourage furthering healthy and

stronger bargaining methods with organized labor unions” (The University of Virginia 2012).

Despite these successes, the Reagan administration’s energy was hard to sustain. The Federal Reserve ultimately acknowledged that they had implemented irresponsible fiscal policies creating “The Great Inflation” of the 1970s. Volcker’s actions tightening the money to curb inflation through 1982 had terrible consequences. The economy plunged into a recession along with Reagan’s approval ratings.

Reagan reached his lowest point with an overall approval rate of only 35 percent during the Iran-Contra scandal. His tax bill made the deficit bigger. The 1982 budget deficit was \$113 billion, thanks to an extra \$30 billion added after Carter left office. Unemployment also rose to 11 percent, and protestors complained loudly about Reagan’s policies when he campaigned for Republicans in the 1982-midterm elections (The University of Virginia 2012).

### **Reagan Endorses Economic Policies**

In biographies written about Ronald Reagan, the literature includes both positive and negative retrospectives. He was seen as the common man, the movie star, and as a president who left behind an economic legacy of “Reagonomics.” From 1979 to 1982, President Reagan and his administration are held responsible for the elimination of many top-paying and top-skilled manufacturing jobs that vanished. They are also seen as being at fault for the elimination of 250,000 auto industry jobs.

While the high-paying, high-skilled jobs were being cut, Reagan saw to it that these positions were quickly replaced with less-skilled workers who worked for lower wages. From 1963 to 1973, only 40 percent of all new jobs in the United States paid higher wages, 20 percent stayed at the bottom of the pay scale. From 1979 to 1985 low-paying jobs made up for 40 percent of the overall job growth, while only 10 percent of all jobs only paid higher wages.

Furthermore, Reagan's administration was using more of the country's financial resources than ever before. In 1980 the government was spending as much as 35 percent of the gross national product (GNP). In contrast, spending in 1950 was only 24 percent of the GNP, and in 1960 GNP spending was only 29 percent (Encyclopedia 2012).

Although unemployment reached double digits by the late 1970's at the end to the Carter era, during the Reagan administration those percentages continued to escalate.

The combination of high inflation and high unemployment rates created an economically unstable country, and the American standard of living fell to fifth in the world. This information tells us that the combination of economic stagnation, high unemployment, and high inflation was called stagflation (recession) and can be perilous within a society (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **A Carbon Copy Administration**

Of course, Reagan blamed the Carter administration for this phenomenon in the 1980 presidential elections. Reagan criticized Carter for the \$40 billion deficit incurred blaming Carter's administration for increased red tape, suffocating economic growth, and

overregulation. Reagan vowed to implement deregulation during his administration. And, Reagan assured his constituents he'd balance the United States budget if elected. Reagan promises have been viewed in retrospect as a combination of economic libertarianism, supply-side economics, and a complex tax scheme intended to energizing the economy by increasing government spending. Economists now believe that policy was nothing more than a waste of funds.

Instead, economists believe taxes should have been cut and incentives created to encourage savings and investment. In the end, Reagan's one-time adversary in the Republican primaries, George Bush, coined the phrase "voodoo economics." The information on this is listed in the Encyclopedia and says, "Today the term, "voodoo economics" is only used to describe failed tax policies that are intended to generate new revenue to offset money lost through tax reductions" (Encyclopedia 2012).

Bush wasn't the only one opposed to Reagan's economic theories. Conservative Republicans were skeptical about Reagan's abstract viewpoints and the basis of his ideas concerning economics. But, the public, sick of the economic plunge in the 1970s, saw Reagan's policies of cutting taxes, balancing the budget, separating bureaucracy, decreasing government spending, and deregulation as a magic answer. This willingness to accept his untested policies, based on his charisma, appealed to many constituencies and helped him wins the election (Encyclopedia 2012).

Reagan as the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) appointed David Stockman. Stockman had been a member of the House of Representatives, and friend to Jack Kemp. He was a key player in developing the Kemp-Roth tax bill that was poised to

offer significant tax cuts. Stockman assembled a package that combined proposals for 64 billion dollars in budget cuts with a 30 percent tax-cut plan from Kemp-Roth. These budgets cuts in Reagan and Stockman's plans targeted many social programs in February 1981.

The facts listed in the Encyclopedias archives on Reagan says, "These tax cuts like others by the administration said they could only be made by cutting Social Security benefits for early retirees and reducing the rates of automatic cost-of-living adjustments for those receiving Social Security" (Encyclopedia 2012).

In the beginning the congressional response in both the House and Senate seemed prepared to accept Reagan's plan, but as the legislative process stalled support for the plan weakened. In fact, no cuts to Social Security benefits survived. However, progress was made in the reduction of tax rates Originally, taxes for people in high-income brackets would begin paying 50 percent on their earned income (wages and salaries) and 70 percent on unearned income (from sources such as investments) bracket. While supporters applauded this at the time, the policies created significant inequities in the new tax system.

By 1983, this tax bracket was reduced to thirty-seven and one half percent on all income. The encyclopedia states, "A substantial flattening of the rate of progression in tax rates to those in lower brackets saw smaller reductions. Critics pointed out that the new tax bill included substantial loopholes, creating inequities and new tax breaks for special interests, and as a result, tax reductions did not generate enough income required to sustain and it increase revenue, so instead the amount of deficit grew larger. In 1982,

Reagan's deficit ended up three times the size of the \$40 billion blamed previously on the Carter administration by Reagan during the 1980's campaign prior to Reagan's win" (Encyclopedia 2012).

Due to apprehensions about the mounting deficit, both Senators Robert Dole; Republican from Kansas and Jesse Helms; Republican from North Carolina implored President Reagan to accept modifications to his tax reform plan and eliminate certain cutbacks. Convinced by both Dole and Helms, Reagan eventually agreed to increase gasoline and Social Security taxes in 1982. Then Ultimately in 1985, two senators in the President's own party, effectively dismantled his tax cuts. Phil Gramm; Republican from Texas and Warren Rudman; Republican from New Hampshire introduced legislation requiring that the federal deficit be cut by specific amounts over a several-year period or that across-the-board cuts be made in all programs (Encyclopedia 2012).

The proposal acquired the support of most Republicans and received adequate and crucial Democrats to pass the bill in December the same year. And, while the bill was well intentioned, it exempted spending for Social Security, interest on the national debt, and existing government contracts to purchase equipment for buildings, military equipment and other arrangements from these cuts, thereby removing a substantial portion of annual federal expenditures from its provisions.

The encyclopedia tells us that in 1986 the Gramm-Rudman Act was additionally weakened when the Supreme Court found some of its provisions unconstitutional. And, nevertheless, Congress made an attempt to live up to its provisions in 1986 and 1987. Reagan's ambitious military spending program and especially the controversial Star Wars



program in the end came under the scalpel, making the 1987 defense-budget increase the smallest since 1981 (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **U.S. Tax Reform**

Soon after the 1981 tax-reform bill was passed, Democrats in Congress took the opportunity to insist on correcting inequities resulting from Reagan's tax policies. . In the spring of 1982, Senator Bill Bradley; Democrat from New Jersey and Congressman Richard Gephardt; Democrat from Missouri sponsored a tax-reform proposal to eliminate preferences and deductions for higher income taxpayers. The bill was intended to cut tax rates reducing the tax burden on the inner-city poor (Encyclopedia 2012).

The Reagan administration gradually supported many portions of the bill proposal, ultimately decided in December 1984; Reagan announced a new administration plan incorporating many features quite generous to corporations. Regan's Chief of Staff during his first administration and was Secretary of the Treasury during Reagan's second administration, was James Baker. Baker also expanded on this plan siding with Reagan. In May of 1985, President Reagan presented the new tax proposal, televised worldwide, and by September the same year, Congress passed the tax-reform bill. This bill lowered the highest tax rate to 25 percent for personal income and eliminated many personal deductions. But, withholding revenues from personal income taxes at roughly the same level and reducing corporate shares of the income-tax structure substantially. Simply stated, just another provision that only added even more fuel to the already burning deficit (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **Deregulation Nurtured by Reagan**

Another pillar of Reagan's plan was to reduce government regulations claiming they were a deterrent to modernizing America. Within two days of his inauguration, Reagan appointed his committee under the supervision of elected Vice President George Bush to find ways of eliminating economic and social regulations.

Again more facts about Reganomics in the encyclopedia tell us, "In February 1981 the President issued an Executive Order requiring that all proposed regulations had to be reviewed by the OMB and subjected to cost-benefit analysis before they could be approved and implemented, almost two years later, by 1983, the new regulations proposed each year reduced federal oversight of programs by 33 percent" (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **A Deregulation of the U. S. Airline Industry**

With the Air Transportation Act of 1978, Reagan began the deregulation of route allocations and fare setting by federal government agencies. In 1984, he eliminated the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), which had been responsible for routes and fares, (Encyclopedia 2012).

In Reagan's attempts to deregulate control mechanisms he appointed regulatory board members who shared his views on government deregulation. For example, he appointed Anne Gorsuch Burford, as head of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

By 1983, the EPA reduced enforcement actions by 84 percent, and suits against persistent violators had decreased by 78 percent. In March of 1983, Burford retired in the middle of

an inquiry into her mismanagement of environmental-cleanup funds. James Watt, then Secretary of Interior, also came under scrutiny in his role of giving away mineral rights for public lands to mining interests. He was also cited for his resistance to increasing fees for the use of public lands for grazing. His anti-conservation stance brought him great censure from conservation and environmental groups alike. Under pressure, Watt resigned in October 1983. His public use of ethnic slurs also contributed to his downfall (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **Reduced Enforcement Levels**

The Reagan administration further impaired enforcement by federal agencies by reducing budgets and personnel. The Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) budget was cut by 25 percent, and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) suffered a cut of 5 percent, the result was a 9 percent increase in unemployment for federal workers. Agencies continued to reduce the number of citations and other enforcement activities... The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), was charged with protecting employees still working the job, but it had also reduced issuing citations by 90 percent. Other long-established agencies also lost their influential positions. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) folded on its crusade for automobile airbags (favored by auto insurance industry) and instead promoted seatbelts, which was favored by the automobile industry. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) quit supporting a no-risk policy concerning traces of carcinogens in foods and adopted one that allowed for minimum risk (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **With Good News Come Bad News**

The fallout of the rising deficit, deregulation and tightening of federal budgets became painfully clear toward the end of Reagan's Presidency. The stock market crashed on October 19, 1987 falling 508 points on the New York Stock Exchange. This was the largest drop in history at a whopping 23 percent in a single day. This exceeded that of the stock-market crash back in 1929 that led to the Great Depression. Analysts attributed investors' sudden paranoia to worries over Reagan administration's deficits and trade inequities (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **Out of the Reagan Administration into the Bush Administration**

After the failed policies of Reaganomics, an exhausted public remembered fondly the original pejorative comments of the Vice President George Bush Sr. Although Bush ended up as Reagan's running mate his comments on "voodoo economics" harkened back to the skepticism the public found more comforting and familiar after the roller coaster ride of supply side economics.

The economy slowed somewhat in 1988 and 1989, but an overall return to prosperity aided George Bush's campaign to succeed Ronald Reagan as president. In April 1989 Bush and the Democratic Congress surprised many commentators by reaching a consensus, claiming a balanced budget and a reduced deficit as priorities. By October 15th, the automatic budget-reduction provisions of the Gramm-Rudman Act went into effect. The budget passed on through November 22 and spending continued at the Gramm-Rudman level until February 1, 1990 when the regular budget became active. Documented, the spending at reduced levels and delaying new spending for a quarter

year, allowed government to reduce the deficit by some \$14.7 billion and the new budget cuts on military spending, especially the Star Wars program, which had 25 percent cut from the funding initially that was proposed in Bush's first budget memorandum (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **The Reforms**

Nearing towards the end of the decade, economists and sociologists were critical of the strengths and weaknesses of the economy and the society of the Reagan years. Reagan's policies had been partially responsible for a reducing the rates of government spending. The rise in inflation that began in the late 1960s and continued through the 1970s had been eliminated although the encyclopedia describes that much of the credit due for this improvement could be traced back to the tight-money policies of Paul Volcker and the Federal Reserve Board. Substantial reform had been made in the income-tax structure by reducing the highest tax rates hypothetically speaking in terms of freeing up money for savings and investment (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **The Deficit**

Written facts in the Encyclopedia inform us that U.S. economist worried as the public debt escalated during the Reagan years. And, by the time he finished his two terms as President, U.S. debt increased an additional \$1.7 trillion dollars added on top of the already outlandish \$907 billion federal deficit in existence since 1981. The addition money added by Reagan to the national debt was 2.5 times larger than the total accumulated debts of all previous presidents before him. Ultimately these consequences

made the U.S. deficit reduction become more a major theme amongst political debate. Economists also worried about the trade deficits in the United States that was incurring annually (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **Economic Restructuring**

At the end of Reagan's administration, and once again economists and sociologists were also expressing their concerns about the restructuring of the American economy. While high compensated, highly skilled manufacturing jobs continued to be replaced by lower-waged service jobs, and the income structure of the United States was changing accordingly. And in final our facts from the Encyclopedia concerning Reagan's era tell us for most of the post-World War II period, the United States had a determined, healthy and strong middle class whose disposable income grew substantially in the 1960s. But, as the 1980s ended, the observant economists and sociologists pointed out the decreasing size of the middle class along with the vast increase in the total percentage of the population under the poverty level. The facts here articulate, "Economists and sociologists are concerned by the implications of a future class and income structure looking more like America in the 1920s than that of the 1950s or 1960s" (Encyclopedia 2012).

### **IV. Findings / Analysis:**

Many if not all organizations public or private including the presidency and the government actively adapt to their environments. These types of organizations, face complex and highly uncertain environments everyday that typically differentiate so that

each organizational unit may face less but more well-defined issues or problems within the organizations structure or theory of dilemma and therefore must decide in the best interest of the organizations success regardless of internal or external autonomous behaviors by all varied cultures. One thing is for sure, after a three-year study researching the field of Political Science, the education administered by the philosophies of the many expert faculty members at Ball State University is forwarded herein this case study.

To begin, I would like to start with this statement with regarding respect to all of mankind and autonomy in general. So before we indulge into the findings and analysis section of the case study at hand. Here is a simple thought quite obvious regardless of authority, status and power. The quality of life can be defined by the levels of enjoyment in one's life and can be based on many factors. By minimum, a person's basic needs must be met in order to possess an elevated value of oneself and their life. And, generally the individual must be healthy, have clothes, food and shelter. When a person's basic needs have been met, generally, a person's quality of life then is fundamentally determined by the individuals personality, desires and levels of personal fulfillment.

It is no secret that people with higher qualities of life are more inclined to feel all of their imperative needs and wants are or have been fulfilled. People are also usually very happy overall and feel as though their life is good, but on the other hand a person without such quality of life lacks in one or several basic areas of his life it is often said these individuals have a low quality of life. In final need and want are two entirely different words that have two entirely different meanings. So what I aim to say here is when are needs or wants confused with self-determination and greed that never seem to encompass

the entire personality, desire or levels of fulfillment in a person's life. Even here we find a complete division and no equilibrium when tipping the scales of justice.

### Organizational Structure

Government is a body that has the authority to make decisions for a governed society on policies affecting the preservation of order and the achievement of certain societal goals. The power of a government over its citizens varies to a great extent depending on the degree to which it is contained by limitations and restraints.

American political culture has always been tied directly to this kind of democracy promotion and the religious characteristics not covered in this case study have been strongly influenced by American policy. The promotion of Democracy is American policy, not a new development. Comprehension of what democracy means is to better understand why policy is tied directly to our own culture and sense of identity. Our identities include believing that policy should be promoted worldwide. By reviewing the positives of any one given policy, only then do people begin to envision the rationalization for promoting democracy worldwide, but in many ways limit the true reality of such a policy by its possible real-world consequences.

The analysis of guiding statutes of federal agencies indicates the conclusion that a divided government delegate's authority to the executive significantly more thorough and constraining statutes than unified governments. As mentioned previously in the literature, this is exactly what Taratoot and Nixon argue and say that this type of influence on the government and agency procrastination should be expected. Taratoot and Nixon say,



“Inter-branch conflict between the President and Congress leads legislators to seek to retain legislative control over the bureaucracy and the results are periods of divided government that increase statutory control and reduce agency autonomy” (Taratoot and Nixon 2011).

As the pendulum of anxiety results between the executive branch and Congress, it swings extensively back and forth dependent upon the level of division between the governing groups of conflict. Avoidance positions itself alongside the executive branch that inclined to achieve and maintain the most power. The federal level consistently a divided government leads to changes in the kinds of laws that Congress and the president can harmoniously agree on (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

Conceivably they both are viewed as a responsible party government; American politics are generally inclined to consider we are a unified government, a single-party control of all the institutions of government. And conspicuously different, but more importantly considering the maintenance of a pure divided government where one party controls the executive and the other party controls the legislature with all due respect (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

Personally, identifying with these divisions and by their all-encompassing methods, the congressional chambers are the real lawbreakers in the budgetary failure and legislative (constitutional) deadlock that we see in the divided government, under this very emphasis for decision decision making purposes and their consequences of both, the legislative and the executive branch struggle within that same divided government.

Nearly all administrative processes of writing and amending statutes is done by our government is conducted by and among the legislators, not shocking to discover the battles between the chambers is especially important, so to say, autonomously affecting content outlined in legislation. But many unidentified researchers claim that Congress and the presidency disagree.

All involved in administrative politics argue as to who controls the government, most agree that both the president and Congress continuously pursue their influence over the entire administrative system and its elected officials. The swaying of the pendulum creates an autonomous situation in which all branches seek to gain more power over the other (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

A Congress of the opposite party of the president is especially motivated to maintain control over federal agencies and avoid tipping the balance of power (scales of justice) in favor of the executive. If the president's party also controls one of the legislative chambers, the remaining chamber retains a statutory obstruction, fixing its position of power into agency policies by virtue of detailed statutory protections against future changes in policy and alleviating important types of political decisions from having any future political control. Both components of having a divided government could cause legislators to hastily write more specific statutes when creating administrative agencies, becoming difficult for the president or future legislators to shift agency policy (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

As a result of the political struggle between Congress and the president, as well as between the two chambers, we would expect to address how a particular type of divided government that may influence the manner in which authority is statutorily delegated to the executive branch. The one perspective when dealing with a division within legislature, the indications of delivering extensive delegation of authority upon the executive with the provisions of a wider array of policy tools used by the executive. This also leads to the enactment of stricter policies (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

A divided government is specifically detrimental by encouraging the growth of the executive, at least in terms of the federal budget. Nevertheless a purely divided government has a greater impact on legislative deadlock finding that state legislatures are more likely to make use of statutory controls when legislative control is split, the difference is not significant among all legislation. (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

Because government is divided they are potentially collinear factors leading to longer or shorter guiding statutes enacted by Congress and this points to the prominence of the agency's budget as a constraint focusing on the use of the budget as a tool of control, the budget of an agency might serve as a control for the varying scope of authority among different agencies. This reasonably suggest that organizations with more employees and larger budgets might require Congress to provide more details on the structure of their organization, all else being equal.

Budget dollars flow more freely under a divided government, and especially under a quasi-divided government, although not mentioned up till now. Thus, longer statutes may not be genuinely related or resemble the divided government by its assets of having larger

budgets. The presence of control for the initial budget of the agency serves to remove the illegitimacy. Initially our nations initial budget is measured in real dollars appropriated by Congress for the agency's first fiscal year of existence (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

Budget figures also adjust to dollars compensating for inflation scaled in billions of dollars in this analysis. Thus, it is expected the larger the initial budget allocation for any agency in its first year, the more specific the guiding statute should be. The smaller the initial budget distribution for an agency in its first year, the more general the guiding statute must be.

Arguably, the purpose of these types of organizations certainly can be recognized by noticeable differences between, independent agencies alike. Regulatory boards, commissions, cabinet-level departments, advisory committees, and government corporations can be the creation of a successful cabinet-level department and perceptively speaking in terms of the highest-profile category of legislation that delegates authority to agencies that umbrella the control of the executive branch; therefore, such statutes might be expected to be lengthier.

Independent regulatory commissions are traditionally conceived and nearly routing the extensions of Congress with significant protection from the White House, so statutes for such agencies might be significantly shorter, all else being equal. Because government corporations are likely to head off in various directions, the market, in spite of opposition from elected officials, dictates statutes creating such organizations might also exhibit more described restraints up front to citizens by the consequential autonomous decisions they make for the organization itself.

It is also important to include the additional control for any potential, perhaps the insipid trend toward statutes that may be evident in congressional productivity. The presence of tendency safeguards policy-making measures that properly assess the impacts of those important institutional organizational changes. This also ensures tendency in other autonomous variables that do not contaminate the estimate of their charismatic impact on statutes. As a result, we can expect that later Congresses will create longer and more detailed delegations of authority to the executive by way of political autonomy, a model that directly challenges the process of culture change.

By the instinctive collection of these organizations mentioned above whose structures are not fixed into the environment including all other organizations, communities, citizens and governments involved, and by other research during this study, not mentioned reveals repetitiously that these organizations will not perform well and are likely to fail drastically within the first couple of years. And, subsequent failure thereafter due to a cycle of human evolution in an environment that is unwavering by its use of fraudulent and inappropriate autonomous behaviors and self centered decision making methods.

Authority and the structure of organization can be regarded in the official hierarchy logic as the right to command whereas power can be considered as the capacity to secure the supremacy (dominating) of one's values or goals. This is what aids in the creation and safeguarding mechanisms for the structure of any organization so that the organization can not only sustain itself but also grow and without authority would be possible.

Organization, nevertheless aren't full proof or perfect frictionless organisms. The role of each participant must be replaced generation after generation. Machines, technologies

and buildings must be replaced or modified. In all supplies are consumed. The organization encompasses nonconcrete designs and extensive abilities that embody the forever processes of being used. The organization functions in an ever-changing environment and each change must be received as a demand for some responsive change within the organizational system both for failure or success.

These apparatuses cannot be approached in an unconventional, incompetent or a biased view of division (survival of the fittest) in decision-making agenda's that require social economic maintenance for life, liberty and justice for social prosper mechanisms. It hinders leadership in most organizations, even government to be successful and well-adapted to their environment, not because of the changes made within themselves, but because those changes that were not well-adapted within the organization of mind to succeed for society as a whole.

An in-depth look at our government and the presidency's organizational culture from the origins of culture to its relationship with organizational effectiveness, the exposure of our government and presidency's ethics and evolutionary decisive behaviors is an open topic. The thorough coverage of each pillar's approach to these organizations whether internal or external, lateral, bilateral, vertical or horizontal the implications of their approach for organizational effectiveness gives different explanations of the most recent developments in policy and organizational structure and as such, their teams amplification in policy production is becoming of their organizational structure that must use outsource and network with other organizations in compatibility.

Discussion of the literature throughout the case study concerning our government's inter-organizational relationships and its methods being used account for to poverty mechanisms by government and the presidency's role with resources are becoming extinct. At current simply the revelation of decisions that have gained only a large financial debt that has revolutionized into dependency and transaction theories for explaining why organizations choose different types of autonomous relationship mechanisms. It is an integrated description of the organizations strategic structure within government. And, these promises of commitment are concurrent by alienated relationships that have various political interests, supporters and electorate masses.

In final, to consider the research conducted by Taratoot and Nixon, the claim is "Divided governments produce more specific statutes when authorizing the creation of new agencies than unified governments, and if a federal agency is created under a unified government, clientele groups tend to be rewarded with an agency that is less bound by statutory controls and more able to serve the needs of their clients (the public)" (Taratoot, Nixon 2011).

#### Autonomy, Politics, Causation and Empowerment

Complex and highly uncertain environmental changes every day typically differentiate so each organizational unit should face more certain issues or problems within the organizations structure or theory of it own entity (e.g. Personnel, Labor and Leadership Roles) deemed necessary to be a celebrated and honest organization. A big factor is the comprehension of the history of these positions or roles without violating human rights such as employment or wage discrimination, equal rights...and using human capital

management systems as deemed autonomously correct. Allowing for a proper chain of command (pyramiding) to advancement, and for instance an irrevocable breaking so to say of the glass ceiling for woman in the workforce of organizations truly in representation of the effects of proper management (in charge) of any organization.

The reforms have less to do with the latest tribulations than a long-standing culture of problems within government and the presidency.

More than just the 19th, 20th, or a 21st century problem, people have treated the symptom but not the root cause. There needs to be a shift to raise the bar in all directions of public and private administration proposing the necessary changes although they may not realize it, they are acting as leaders, in the forefront on economic and other policy issues while all along making them look more fragile for our future to flourish and prosper to carry forward a nation. For if the future of government or the positions of the president not have their confidence when it comes to the organization and trickle down theory upon society they would have no offering to their decisions at the present if there is an issue of an autonomously errant, ignorant and deceitful culture running rampant.

The public deserves to have an outside team of experts look at the extension of such errant culture in order to propose changes that come from more a broader expertise regardless of authority, control or power. Overall, without full disclosure of what the problems are whether historical or at the current it is difficult to know if what is being proposed with a cure of distraction or malignance inside government and or the presidency when it involves a nation not just particular actors of oligarchy alone.



Being duly sworn, government and the presidency's true mission statement to the public and colleagues first and foremost is public safety, next economic standards, and etc. however, the must to do also done by having the confidence of the public's faith in both organizations. This is essential in a utopia kind of way for leadership roles, and when those roles are not being abused. It is appalling to notice unacceptable standards that violate the U.S. Constitution and our civil rights that ensure us, the recipients, the nation and all other components to sustain life and not engaged by a prohibited discriminating government and/or presidency generation after generation. Another primary objective in accomplishing this mission is to safeguard prompt, but full compliance with all civil rights laws and regulations so that needed Federal aid may commence or continue regardless of status. The agencies of government must be supportive in the teachings designed to educate and help not hinder a society by autonomous behavior that is negligence affecting all under its umbrella not just the decision maker with authority and power vested to misuse.

At best example, the Equal Rights Amendment meant freedom from legal sex discrimination. Alice Paul's an American suffragist and activist. Along with Lucy Burns and many others, led a successful campaign believing that equal rights required an Equal Rights Amendment that would affirm the equal application of the Constitution to all citizens. Francis tells us that Alice Paul introduced the Lucretia Mott Amendment, which read: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction" and, Francis claims this very amendment was introduced

in every session of Congress until finally in 1972, it passed only by the account of rewording it (Francis 2010).

Francis states, “Although a number of educated professionals (women) alongside the National Woman’s Party to include Amelia Earhart, who supported the amendment, reformers who had worked for protective labor laws that treated women differently from men were frightened that the ERA would destroy already made progress” (Francis 2010).

In the early 1940s, not only the Republican Party, but also the Democratic Party combined enhanced the support of the Equal Rights Amendment to their platforms. Alice Paul rewrote the ERA in 1943 now called the Alice Paul Amendment. “And”, says Francis, “It mirrors both the 15th and 19th amendments stating that the equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any other state on the account of gender. But the labor movement was still committed to protective laws in the workplace, but social conservatives considered equal rights for women a threat to the existing all-powerful structure of government” (Francis 2010).

In the 1960s, 100 years after the fight to end slavery fostered that first wave of the women’s rights movement, and the battle over civil rights at that time provided motivation for the second wave. Women systematized and demanded their birthright as citizens and persons of equal value to society, and of the Equal Rights Amendment, which became the central symbol of struggle, rather than acquiring the right to vote. “Finally”, says Francis, “Organized labor and an increasingly large number of mainstream groups joined the call for the ERA, and politicians reacted to the power of

organized women's voices and done in a certain manner never before accomplished since the battle for the right to vote" (Francis 2010).

Francis informs us, that the Equal Rights Amendment was passed in the U.S. Senate and then by the House of Representatives, then On March 22, 1972, the anticipated proposal of the 27th Amendment to the Constitution was sent to the states to be ratified. But, Francis explains, "Just as it had been done for every amendment since the 18th (Prohibition), with the exception of the 19th Amendment, Congress placed a seven-year deadline on the ratification process, and this time a limit was placed not in the words of the ERA itself, but in a proposing clause" (Francis 2010).

Francis says, "Just like the 19th Amendment before it, the ERA barreled out of Congress, getting 22 of the necessary 38 state ratifications in the first year", says Francis, "But the pace slowed as opposition began to organize itself with only eight ratifications in 1973, there was only three in 1974, one in 1975, and none in 1976 and the political tide continued to turn even more conservative" (Francis 2010). In 1980 it was the Republican Party that removed ERA support from its platform, and Ronald Reagan was elected president. Although pro-ERA activities increased with massive lobbying, petitioning, countdown rallies, walkathons, fundraisers, and even the radical suffragist tactics of hunger strikes, The White House picketing, and civil disobedience, ERA did not succeed in getting three more state ratifications before the deadline. And Francis verbalizes, "The country was still unwilling to guarantee women constitutional rights equal to those of men" (Francis 2010).

Francis declares, “The Equal Rights Amendment was reintroduced again in Congress on July 14, 1982 as it has been before during every session of Congress since that time. In the 110th Congress (2007-2008), and has been introduced ever since, even lead by sponsors such as Senator Edward Kennedy and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York”, and, “These bills imposes no deadline on the ERA ratification process. Success in putting the ERA into the Constitution via this process would have require passage by two-thirds in each house of Congress and ratification by 38 states as is required for all policy and or amendments” (Francis 2010).

An alternative strategy for ERA ratification has arisen from the “Madison Amendment,” its apprehension modifies Congressional pay, which was passed by Congress in 1789 and finally it was ratified in 1992 by the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. Its acceptance of an amendment after a 203-year ratification period has led some ERA supporters to propose that Congress has the power to maintain the legal viability all policy or amendments made to the Constitution for society to prosper or fail for Congress can choose to legislatively adjust or repeal existing time limit constraints on any policy of choice determining validity and promulgation.

Human beings commonly desire a complete life, liberty, mating, family, friendships and some kind of social status, justice reciprocity towards all, political rule, valor in war, health and beauty, property, dialogue, practical but familiarization of their society, practical reasoning, religious accepting, and intellectual understanding of how government and the presidency organization is structured. This is the perfect example of personnel, labor and leadership roles within an organization. Without such human natural

attributes within each individual who is part of the whole, organizations would not exist let alone succeed. These characteristics by human nature are what society is made up of and a necessary requirement to all life's purpose.

Within all organizations communication is inevitable and throughout history our interpretations of this have made inter-linguistic communication between people and the possibilities, theoretically speaking; one can consider translation a science. Language by translation practically seems rational enough to consider it an art, however, regardless of whether one considers translation as a science, art, or craft, all should bear in mind that good translation should fulfill the same function, as it should the receiver. The fact that communication and leadership are more than just mere methods to any organization and these methods have many attributes that not only are detrimental to government and the presidency as an organization but that it is not just an upward, downward motion, but also it moves lateral at times making it a pyramid of information that with evolution, technology and people changes swiftly with the sole meaning to convey important information to the receiver.

Government provides equal opportunity to society as a whole according to our written laws with the disclaimer they will not discriminate in any matter or condition on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, veteran status, gender identity, or sexual orientation. This policy is most applicable among all policies that govern the recruitment of placement, selection, promotion, transfer, rates of pay, benefits and all other terms and conditions of employment by all government activities (decisions). What are the consequences when the numbers, however, do not reveal the

changing nature of the work itself, the job, the environment or the treatment by others that are not just internal types of support, but for external support in career development, promotion and other rewards virtually absent by the escalating levels of poverty that face considerable amounts of discrimination by the upper class, suggestively speaking.

At current Congress and President Obama have decided to commit \$787 billion in spending and tax relief for the nation in the hopes of stimulating the economy and creating jobs across the United States. Hopefully this budget will be spent working diligently with federal and state government agencies along with congressional delegates to allocate the stimulus money in the best interests of all communities. This becoming of the same old question of whether or not the budget it is for public safety, transportation, sustainability, or education and jobs, the promise to make sure the funds (budget) are spent wisely with the goal of enhancing societies livability in mind with having a superior exchange of motivation, productivity and the notion or belief herein that some of these basic guidelines for conducting a productivity improvement exercises itself by establishing what needs to be improved and why.

To establish an appropriate productivity measure and a corresponding measuring system for assessing fiscal policy and at the current level of productivity by stretch efficiency goals identifying key factors impacting on the nations productivity measures. A need to form and train a multi-functional productivity improvement team that conduct a critical multi-dimensional analysis of each impacting factor focusing primarily on the underlying processes of government and the presidency by the establishment of new policy and procedures in keeping up with recommendations for improvement always when selling

their recommendations to all of the stakeholders within the organization. Government and the presidency must facilitate new procedures where appropriate and finally, establish a system for the monitoring and reviewing of all new and old policy procedures.

The annual budget must be prepared as the most important (working) operational plan that, upon approval, becomes a legal working document. And, just the type of process critical providing many benefits listed herein. The budget is key, it provides standards against which actual performance can be measured; Causes managers to focus their attention from current to future operations; Allows managers to reassess goals and objectives and the means for accomplishing them; Improves top management's ability to coordinate the overall operation of the organization; Facilitates communication throughout the organization; and Assists managers in recognizing when change is needed (CCCO).

A common problem in government as in any other occupation is trying to identify and manage problematic employees. A difficult task, but it is a crucial objective by government organizations for their efforts in dealings with economic conditions, fatal to survival of a nation when its production and trade need to be efficient, objective and fair on self-restraint throughout its costs. By nature it is fact that all members of the U.S. Government (Congress, Senate and House) to the President and his chosen administration, all human and like any other employee (worker), Some may have a negative impact on the Governments organization not just on the inside of the department, but that outside the department. So, by following the effectiveness in

identifying such individuals in turn will help improve the moral and performance of each employee if possible.

Another important managerial aspect in government is the proper delegation of authority and power. Tasks, duties and responsibilities should and need be delegated or assigned to those subordinates who are trustworthy in using power and authority to properly control/command and make decisions that truly act in the group's best interest for 'order' to complete all viable tasks within the organization. The Government is a pillar of all law established in the U.S. A basic requirement of any organization, especially government, one who intends (claims) to promote and encourage fairness to all levels of subordinates regardless of their wealth or poverty grasp what leadership means by being disclosed.

In observation of Autonomy, Politics, Causation and Empowerment, for many years, the corporate world gives way to the impression of moving toward more self-governing processes and in areas as such; shared leaderships and participative management models which, in the workplace make many efforts to try and improve competitiveness by discovering experience, knowledge, talents, and creativity abilities of their employees.

By using these methods of participative management, organizations have shown greater improvement in terms of productivity, quality and workers satisfaction. However, these power-sharing methods have established very little acceptance in policing organizations. And, at a time, when all along government and the presidency have been emphasizing proactive, community-oriented approaches to economic solutions. In transformation of these services initialization may include provisions of employment empowerment and



shared leadership which otherwise may offer significant advantages over traditional top to bottom government administration.

### The Occupation-President Ronald Reagan

Urban Affairs Center (UAC) Reports from 1985 to 1989 under their “Federal Policy Impact Study” say, “During President Reagan first administration he enjoyed considerable success in redeeming his 1980 campaign pledge to reduce the role of government in domestic affairs and alter national-state and national-local governmental relationships” (UAC 1989).

UAC reports that in Reagan’s fourth State of the Union message, delivered on February 6, 1985, he maintained, “four years ago, we began to change--forever I hope--our assumptions about government and its place in our lives” (UAC 1989). And UAC claims, “The results at the federal level of government are reasonably clear. “However”, UAC confirms, “Our federal system of government is complex and national presidential and congressional actions are not translated automatically into policy and program at the state and local level” (UAC 1989). Nor should the national impact to whatever degree it is translated into policy and program at the local level be expected to affect uniformly various kinds of agencies and programs (UAC 1989).

According to UAC, local government and community officials have made critical observations about demands for a systematic study of the local impact of the fiscal and policy changes of the federal government during the Reagan administration (UAC 1989). In addition, and for the importance of academic study in Northwestern Ohio, The

University of Toledo that analyzes the local impact of any major overhaul at the national level of our federal system was obviously necessary. And therefore, the Urban Affairs Center began its Federal Policy Impact Study in the spring of 2011 (UAC 1989).

Upon UAC's research findings, they affirm, "The Reagan administration will be considered a watershed administration for its efforts to change assumptions about government's domestic role and about federal-state and federal-local relationships" and, "While his policies have created problems for many agencies, our respondents appear resolute in not wanting to return to a larger federal government role locally" (UAC 1989). UAC also states that most respondents sense that their agencies are benefited more by a healthy economy than by more federal dollars, a sentiment often expressed in more general terms by President Reagan. "Nevertheless, the administration's vision is far from realized; for example, many agency heads see no reduction in federal reporting requirements, nor do they see federal funding as more predictable" (UAC 1989).

UAC tell us that many agencies have been forced to make adjustments and many of them would appear to be positive for them. Having a better staff-client / (public) relations and by introducing other management improvements are not envisioned as an all-positive perspective for all organizations. There is a greater struggle for funding these efforts although they appear that agencies are devoting more labor to this idea.

The government appears suspicious about the increased role of state government in urban affairs (initiatives to improve the quality of life), which President Reagan had envisioned. UAC claim there are many opinionated disagreements about the local impact of the recent federal fiscal and policy changes.

The reason for having the continuing desire, need and want to analyze this local impact to that we can improve the response of local government to the issues and problems, which we, as a community, consider appropriate for government to address” (UAC 1989).

The UAC offer us many reports on President Reagan. In another report from *The Issues Of Local Government Efficiency: The Impact Of The New Federalism*, and written by Ronald Randall and Carter Wilson on March 25, 1985 with the UAC begins with the issue of efficiency is an important dimension of the Reagan administration’s philosophy of New Federalism. According to this report by UAC, “This philosophy, government in general had grown too large, wasteful, bureaucratic, unaccountable and above all, inefficient” (UAC 1989).

The UAC declares that the ‘New Federalism’ was intended to reduce, or at least delay, the growth of federal domestic spending and to pursue policies of ever-changing duties giving a greater responsibility to state and local governments, but a decline in federal resources and decentralization of the federal powers and further consolidations in block grants were calculated to eliminate duplication and waste in order to enhance local governments flexibility and responsiveness to all local needs and constrained local agencies to become more efficient” (UAC 1989). As the national government reduces its involvement in domestic programs, state governments would presumably accept greater programmatic, financial and technical-assistance responsibility (UAC 1989).

Although some areas were vetoed and others were modified, Reagan was quite successful in acquiring most Congressional approval for his domestic policy package. UAC researchers study reports tell us that Federal resources (grants-in-aid) directly allocated to

state and local areas declined about 6 billion from 1981 to 1982 and the states assumed increased responsibilities as more federal funds were funneled through the states.

Allowing time for changes in Washington to have some impacts on local areas, the summer of 1984 appeared to be the opportune time for all findings that would test the assumptions underpinning Reagan's philosophy (UAC 1989).

Like others this UAC study provides a refutation of cutback management theory, but emphatically their findings do not support the expectations of items such as cutback management theories because massive cuts in services, the deterioration in staff/management relations, and the erosion of staff morale did not occur (UAC 1989).

UAC's findings have merely produced ample support for said assumptions to the underlying ideology of Reagan administration's New Federalism. Contrary to President Reagan's expectations about state government responses, the State of Ohio has not filled the gap left by the retreat of the federal government in domestic policy areas (UAC 1989).

Government respondents to UAC's mailed questionnaire survey claim their states are not experiencing any significant increases in state technical assistance of financial aid (UAC 1989). But the respondents believe they are experiencing their devotion to their administrative positions whereby more of their time is spent reporting to their respective state; apparently a function primarily of increased enforcement of existent state requirements rather than newly promulgated ones (UAC 1989). Additionally, UAC researchers say, "Some of the process efficiency gains that they identified appear to have been in place prior to Reagan taking office" (UAC 1989).

These two researchers, Randall and Wilson who helped in UAC's report survey find that most of the changes in intergovernmental relation, as viewed by local administrators, were incremental. Federal funds allocated to local areas are declining, and in most cases, the state is not compensating for the reduction in federal funds (UAC 1989). UAC's reports prove by their survey that the states have assumed more responsibilities under the New Federalism decree although most of our local administrators do not believe the state is prepared to carry out these administrative responsibilities (UAC 1989).

The UAC confirms that these administrators reported increases and decreases by federal reporting requirements are contradictory and are not unexpected. But, the increases in state reporting requirements and mandates are apparently having a restricting effect on local agencies, according to the views and opinions of participating local administrators. UAC conveys, remarkably local administrators are working even closer together with state administrators, but the belief is that state officials are more sympathetic to local problems and issues than federal officials (UAC 1989). With regards to the horizontal federalism side of the ledger, there appears to be a slight incremental increase in functional and allocation rival conflict among local agencies specifically areas of social service. Assuredly UAC announces that these agencies also realize the need for autonomy, competent cooperation and coordination to achieve sustainable social safety nets (UAC 1989).

This study like the many others listed by UAC examines the impact of Reagan administration changes on governmental and non-profit agencies in Northwest Ohio. "An

industrial area anchored by Toledo”, the data for the study originated from a mail-out questionnaire sent to administrators of these agencies” (UAC 1989).

UAC found that after the consolidation of several categorical grants-in-aid into block grants, not many intergovernmental changes anticipated by President Reagan never materialized (UAC 1989). Organizations have gone through difficult financial times in Northwest Ohio, as is the rest of the United States. With administration supplementary to the adjustments made, it is apparent, in the near distant most have weathered the critical moments made to endure. UCA claims the fact is that the recession of 1981-82 produced more problems for local administrators than it did for the federal budget cuts made by Reagan (UAC 1989). UCA states, “The modest local impact of the dramatic national changes is a reminder of the resilience of the federal system. Some of that resilience has manifested itself, however, in local stopgap measures that may lead to serious problems over the long run” (UAC 1989).

Another report given by UAC was compiled by a primary management consultant by the name of Dr. Clint O. Longenecker, he and his assistant, Ms. Sharon Desmond, a graduate student at The University of Toledo together find results of a systematic attempt to accurately assess and describe the current views, perceptions, and attitudes of the organizational audit that is more than intended to enhance the ability of government and administration to affectively monitor, manage, and improve their agency by the collection procedure consisting of the agency’s various staff and program directors and coordinators (UAC 1989).

The information obtained was designed to describe the assessments of the presidency, the administration, government and leadership within the agency by the quality of work life referring to the level of happiness or dissatisfaction with ones profession with the belief those who enjoy their occupation are said to have a high quality of work life and individual substance (UAC 1989).

The findings concerning these entities mentioned above are by no means unusual for government organizations in their areas of expertise and do not necessarily coincide with the activities of the agency or on whose plank they sit. This mitigating comment is not intended to dilute the findings, but rather to encourage government to view them realistically, realizing that their situation is not unique (UAC 1989).

The apparent lack of administrative leadership by the organization might be viewed as a function or a by-product of the fact that governmental agencies that have multiple areas of service and their somewhat ambiguous mission(s); nevertheless, there are no substitutes for effective leadership. In final, UAC says, "The quality of work life findings suggest that workers are generally satisfied with what they are doing but that the overall work environment has room for improvement in the human relations department" (UAC 1989).

Before finishing up facts about President Reagan, lets for a moment stop to view what the position of the President of the United States was really intended since the swearing in of our nations first recognized president, that man was George Washington. Taught in elementary since that invention as well, George Washington, like Roosevelt and Reagan. Assuming office as the president of the United States in no joke and should be taken

seriously. Assuming office the President takes the oath set forth by the Constitution and faithfully executes the duties of office, which is to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States at all cost as the president is charged by the Constitution with executing the laws of the U.S. And these responsibilities of the president are assisted by the vast network of agencies constituting the executive branch of the government and administered by the members of the cabinet, and the heads of other independent federal agencies. By having the given liberty of this responsibility, the president may, at the request by anyone state government, employ the National Guard or federal troops to conquer disorder, suppress insurrection, or repel invasion. Or, the president may declare martial law in times of overwhelming public danger, when the courts cannot intervene or function freely.

NNDB claims they are an intelligence aggregator who trails the doings of people who have been determined “noteworthy, both living and dead” (NNDB 2012). Superficially, seeming like a “Who’s Who” source of information where a noted person’s curriculum vitae are available (the usual information such as date of birth, a biography, and other essential facts) (NNDB 2012). NNDB goal of existence is to document the connections between people, many of which are not always obvious. NNDB simply states that inexplicable behaviors by individuals are often understood by examining the crowd that person associates with (NNDB 2012).

NNDB offers many genuine facts about many different people to the scale of the President of the United States. In their review of facts about Ronald Reagan they offer the “Rotten Library Page”, like it or not, accept the truth. Here NNDB doesn’t hold back



listing actual facts about anyone including President Reagan Wilson Reagan. Caution should be advised for the content in nature is audaciously robust.

NNDB explicitly says, “Everybody knew he was a dumbass” (Anonymous 2012).

Personally, he wasn’t the sharpest tool in the shed by more acceptable terms. But NNDB iterate the facts and say, “Ronald Reagan was famous for not understanding how government works and not particularly caring about it, his job was to read speeches off the Teleprompter, shake hands with foreign dignitaries, pose for pictures, and sometimes he would visit a flag factory or a steel mill every once in a while, if not he was busy sleeping in, eating jellybeans, and watching television” (NNDB 2012).

NNDB says that Reagan received special treatment from the press portraying news coverage that almost always cast him in the best limelight. Extremely comfortable in front of the cameras, as you would expect, Reagan after all, had been a movie star prior to becoming a politician (NNDB 2012). Reagan was disarmingly sociable, often sharing jokes and anecdotes and brilliantly scripted one-liners that sounded spontaneous, but NNDB says none of this explains why journalists decided to go easy on him (NNDB 2012). The author’s of NNDB tell us the reason Reagan achieved a free ride in the media began with his fortuitously timed assassination attempt (NNDB 2012).

The man had been President of the United States for just 69 days when a lunatic trying to impress movie actress Jodie Foster shot him On March 30, 1981. A bullet ricocheted off the Presidential limousine entering Reagan’s chest below his armpit. A Secret Service agent shoved Reagan into the vehicle as limo sped away from the scene. NNDB’s found that when the assassination took place, at first glance, the President appeared to be

unharmd. Regan then said to the agent that helped to protect him, “You son of a bitch, you broke my rib” (NNDB 2012).

Facts stated by NNDB say that before doctors put Reagan under anesthesia, he said he made a comment to hospital personnel. Reagan commented, “Please tell me you’re all Republicans” (NNDB 2012).

In charge of the surgical team was Dr. Joseph Giordano, who was in fact a liberal Democrat. Yet, it is noted he reassured the President he would be okay and that the team of surgeons present were all Republicans that day. After undergoing 3 hours of surgery, Doctors from George Washington Hospital extracted a .22 caliber slug from the 70-year-old President’s left lung. Reagan soon bounced back in no time at all to his administrating position as President” (NNDB 2012).

NNDB says here following Dr. Giordano’s lead, the American people immediately gathered around their wounded leader. Reagan’s popularity ratings suddenly escalated, inflated by public sympathy (NNDB 2012). The national media simply chose to pretend to agree, rather than risk appearing cold or heartless to the public. This respect continued throughout Reagan’s presidency. NNDB declares that if Reagan said something phenomenally stupid during anyone of his press conferences, most of the media just let it go. NNDB verbalizes, “Even when he was obviously lying his ass off, he never truly got called on it, acquiring the nickname “The Teflon President” thanks to this marvel wonders of the nonstick coating applied to cookware (NNDB 2012).

After the shooting, the NNDB tells us that the First Lady Nancy who believed in astrology received a message from her part-time astrologer, Joan Quigley, that she could have predicted March 30 was destined to be a bad day for her husband. And if only Quigley had been on the payroll and rather than risking similar incidents in the future, Nancy decided that it would be wise to keep her astrologer in the mix of things. NNDB says, “Nancy Reagan soon ordered dedicated phone lines be installed both at the White House and Camp David, so she would never be without the wisdom of the Zodiac” (NNDB 2012).

The next eight years, Quigley determined the most opportune timing for all of the President’s crucial activities and the First Lady would furnish Ronnie’s tentative itinerary, which the astrologer would optimize and return (NNDB 2012). The White House staff would make the necessary adjustments in correlation of Quigley’s zodiac offerings. The First Lady’s tampering with and affecting scheduling of press conferences, Air Force One departures and even the timing of international summits, all encompassed Quigley the psychic (NNDB 2012).

NNDB tells us that former White House Chief of Staff Don Regan later wrote in his memoirs, though he had never met this Mrs. Reagan’s profit, the First Lady relayed to him her predictions after speaking with her on a telephone conversation. Regan tells us she had become such an issue in his work in dealing with the highest affairs of the nation. As per NNDB, Regan had kept a color-coded calendar on his desk (numerals highlighted in green ink for “good” days, red for “bad” days, yellow for “iffy” days) as an aid reminding him when it was favorable to move the president of the United States from one

place to another, or schedule him to speak in public, or commence negotiations with a foreign power (NNDB 2012).

Following the astrologer's instructions, NNDB says, claim by Regan on the selection and appointment of Anthony Kennedy to the Supreme Court was announced precisely at 11:32:25 A.M. to the press (NNDB 2012). But according to Regan's memoir, the President was cued by "a man with a stopwatch" to make sure he begin on time. Quigley though does not mention whether she ever gave similar assistance to the President's two previous selections to fill the Supreme Court seat with archconservative Robert Bork or the former 'pot smoker' Douglas Ginsburg, who both failed to gain Senate confirmation" (NNDB 2012).

Superstitious himself, President Reagan always carried a lucky charm in his pocket, knocked on wood, avoided walking under ladders, and having a habit of tossing salt over his left shoulder before every meal (NNDB 2012). "So the consultation given by the profit Quigley and should or should it not be alarming as alluring as it was to President Reagan" (NNDB 2012). NNDB announces facts prior to that of the use of Quigley during Reagan's time as President, "During the 1950s, Ron and Nancy sought out the services of Carroll Righter, astrologer to the stars and when Reagan won California's governor seat he took the advice of Righter and scheduled his inauguration for 12:10 A.M. And in the 1960s, Ron had been consulting with the psychic Jeane Dixon, that had reportedly predicted the assassination of President John F. Kennedy May 13, 1956, and published in

an issue of Parade Magazine, whether or not he (Reagan) should for President someday (NNDB 2012).

NNDB affirms that somehow this behavior of the President never bothered the Christian right bearing in mind though to a fundamentalist Christian, astrology is virtually witchcraft, and well-known prophecy specifically prohibited by the Bible. So it's a little surprising that people like Jerry Falwell, an evangelical fundamentalist Southern Baptist pastor, televangelist, and a conservative overjoyed to express his support. But, despite Reagan's tenacious ongoing reliance upon the dark arts, Reagan was their leader (NNDB 2012).

First and foremost, NNDB's found facts confirming Reagan was a firm believer of Biblical prophecy and specifically believed that the end of the world (The Battle of Armageddon) was close at hand. "And, as we all know", says NNDB's author's, "The fundamentalists just love that eschatological (doctrines about death of the human race and the aftermath) stuff (NNDB 2012).

During his 1980 presidential candidacy, Reagan announced in an interview with Jim Bakker, the notorious televangelist that we may be the generation that sees Armageddon (NNDB 2012). Certainly not the first time Reagan made this inference. NNDB facts say, "At a 1971 banquet for California state senator James Mills, then-Governor Reagan broke it all down for the honoree during the dessert course" (NNDB 2012).

NNDB states this is what Reagan told Mills, "In the 38th chapter of Ezekiel, it says that the land of Israel will come under attack by the armies of ungodly nations and claimed

that Libya will be among them. Reagan then asked Mills if he understood the significance of fact since Libya had then gone Communist, “A sign”, said Reagan that the day of Armageddon was not far off (NNDB 2012). That for decades, generation after the next, Biblical scholars motto was that the Gog must be in Russia asking the same question over again, of what other powerful nation is there north of Israel? And countering none, although it never made sense before the Russian revolution, when Russia was a Christian country. It currently did since Russia became atheistic and communistic positioning itself against God fitting of the description of Gog perfectly (NNDB 2012). NNDB also tells us at this meeting with Mills, Reagan told him it was the first time ever, that all was in place for the battle of Armageddon and the Second Coming of Christ, and that it wouldn’t be too long now because Ezekiel said that fire and brimstone would rain upon the enemies of God’s people, meaning the people would be destroyed by nuclear weapons (NNDB 2012).

NNDB also indicates the fact that Reagan in an interview, published in a December 1983 issue of People magazine, that the most powerful man (President) in the world would reveal his ideology of Armageddon publicly. NNDB declares that Reagan said the Theologians studies into the ancient prophecies on the indications of the coming of Armageddon, and yes, he admitted saying there has never been a time ever between the prophecies up until the current generation in which so many of the prophecies were coming together. And he claimed times in the past when people thought the end of the world would arrive, and so forth, but never anything like it was at that moment” (NNDB 2012).

Then during an October 1984 Presidential debate, the Commander-In-Chief was asked to clarify his position on the matter. Which Reagan kind of avoided when a reporter named Kalb asked the President if he could explain his Armageddon theme for the media and public. Kalb told the President he'd been cited saying that he believed deeply we were headed for some kind of Biblical Armageddon, and in the same sentence asked Reagan if his Pentagon and Secretary of Defense had any solid strategies for the United States effective enough to fight and prevail in the case of a nuclear war. Kalb also asked Reagan if the U.S was perhaps heading towards some sort of nuclear Armageddon. Unceasingly Kalb then asked Reagan if he felt that the country and the world could even possibly survive that sort of catastrophe (NNDB 2012).

NNDB gives us the facts and informs us that President Reagan told Mr. Kalb the thought that he'd been hailed as something, supposedly, as President, during a discussion of principle was the result of just that of a few philosophical discussions with people who had the same commonality of topic interests. That the prophecies through the years of Biblical prophets would portend the coming of Armageddon and so forth, and the fact that numerous theologians for more than a decade believed Armageddon was fact, that the prophecies were aligning to prove it. Reagan told Kalb that no one really knew whether Armageddon, the prophets or prophecies meant that Armageddon was a thousand years away or the day after tomorrow. He claimed he'd never seriously warned the public of this nor said as a nation we must plan according to Armageddon (NNDB 2012).

NNDB credits President Reagan for doing more than just talk the talk. They say he was an ardent supporter of school prayer and anti-abortion laws withholding funding from international contraception programs. He received numerous complaints from the ACLU, and Reagan declared officially in 1983 to be “The Year of the Bible” appointing likeminded ‘Jesus freaks’ as they were called to his cabinet. During a 1981 Congressional hearing, Reagan’s first Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, revealed the depth of his commitment was to preserve America’s environment for the future and Reagan always said the he could not project how many future generations could be counted on before the return of our Lord (NNDB 2012).

Watt, a member of the cabinet and one of the best and brightest America had to offer, says NNDB, “was given other underlings wide latitude to make and implement policy and when Fortune magazine conducted an interview with President Reagan in September 1986, it was here he described his theory of management” (NNDB 2012). The President told Fortune that one must surround himself/herself with the best people that can be possibly found, one must delegate authority, and never interfere. NNDB says, “It was thereafter only a few months later, the full implications of this hands-off managerial philosophy would be made clear when the Iran-Contra scandal broke” (NNDB 2012).

NNDB informs the public that the Iran-Contra was the result and Reagans National Security Council decided to launch an independent (autonomous) secret operation absent thereof any mistake by Congress, the courts, or even the President himself only gestured in the likeness of being self-funded and, consequently, absolutely above the law. NNDB states that Reagan’s operation was recognized internally as ‘The Enterprise’, but it should



have been called 'The Private Enterprise' since its primary goal was only intended to turn profits (NNDB 2012).

Facts reveal the top-secret deal (mission) was to purchase (trade) to aid in the release of American hostages being held in the Middle East and the White House approved the sale of U.S. weapons to Iran, but the deal intended by origin was to stimulate the real objective. NNDB informs us the real plan required NSC's to sale weapons of the Middle East in order to channel some of the profits back to the Contra insurgency in Nicaragua. Historically noted, this act by the presidential administration was nothing more than a barefaced intentional violation of federal law (NNDB 2012). This was the perfect opportunity for a suitable embezzlement sum. No one was double-checking the books. Who would of done the accounting since the maneuver was more than a secret? Only a few dozen members in the White House basement knew about it (absolutely nonexistent) having no oversight whatsoever. NSC's Oliver North wound up with \$200,000 in a Swiss bank account (NNDB 2012).

Reagan, all along pretended there nothing illegal was occurring. And, at one of Reagan's press conferences, a journalist questioned the President specifically targeting these issues when he asked Reagan why we do not openly support the 7,000 guerrillas in rebellion rather than supply aid through covert activities. Reagan told him it was because the U.S. needed to continue obeying the laws of the country like his administration was doing (NNDB). The reporter replied by asking President Reagan if the United States wanted our government replaced, but Reagan reply was No, due to the fact it would be a violation of the law (NNDB 2012).

NNDB lets us know that after the press released the Presidents story, Reagan only continued to deny it all. Finally the moment came when Reagan was forced to deliberate on the growing scandal in November 1986, Reagan claimed the accusations were widely speculative, they were nothing more than false stories of arms for hostages and alleged ransom payments, he claimed he nor any of his cabinet members (repeat) did not trade weapons for any money or for hostages nor would they ever (Reagan 1986) (NNDB 2012).

NNDB says it was one month later that the White House, became impatient after they started receiving reports on the arms-for-hostages deal by the Senate Intelligence Committee. NNDB confirms that Senator Leahy commented on the administrations insistent requests for the report that claimed President Reagan had ordered the whole Iran operation. It said Reagan had ordered a few dozen cabinet members not to tell the intelligence committees what he was doing. Leahy wanted administration to tell him what was going during the time they were under Reagans orders and why they didn't disclose any of the Presidents dealings to the Intelligence Committee (NNDB 2012).

NNDB releases the fact that in January 1987, the testimony given by President Ronald Reagan before the Tower Commission unambiguously acknowledged himself as having approved the Iranian arms sales back in August 1985. Only to withdraw himself from his admission of any Iranian scandal a couple weeks later claiming his previous statement was erroneous. NNDB claims Reagan's behavior as a President reading from his notes similar of his acting career when he read his stage directions aloud (NNDB 2012).

It was thereafter just two weeks later Reagan sent a letter to the commission confirming clarification to his latest testimony, yet again Reagan stated he had been erroneous during his January deposition, wherein he claimed at first to have approved the Iranian arms shipments. Reagan told the commission his only honest answer trying his hardest to recall he did not remember whatsoever approving an Israeli sale in advance or whether he approved any such replenishment of Israeli stocks around August 1985. He claimed his answer was the simple truth therefore and he had no recollection of it occurring (NNDB 2012).

The affiliates of NNDB like many at all levels of society, especially politicians understood all doubt seemed to have disappeared from Reagan's mind later for following the revelations of the Tower Commission investigation, Reagan later again told the American people he had never approved any Iranian scandal and claimed telling American people months ago he never traded arms for hostages. That in his hearts best intentions as if trying to convince him of the true, the facts and the evidence told Reagan the scandal wasn't real (NNDB 2012).

NNDB claims that Reagan even spoke on the subject of his clamorous and vigorous attempts advertising publicly in his delegating techniques to win the electorates. Here, NNDB claims that all college students should take note of Reagan's comment henceforth (NNDB 2012). Reagan declared not much ever was mentioned about his management style, claiming his style worked successfully for him the 8 years as Governor of California and during most of his Presidency. Reagan explained his work ethics required solving the problems of America. And to achieve this, Reagan said a person must

position himself to find competent individuals for the job, and just let them do it. He said his management skills were specific in the area of employee morale that always brought out the best in people. A tactic he says to have habitually used helping his employees rise to their fullest potential, which in the long run provides proficiency within the organization. But, Reagan said when it came to managing the NSC staff; it was more than obvious his current administrative style did not match that of his previous track record (NNDB 2012).

As per NNDB, another victory of maintaining government like a small, but fast moving company worked better for the investors than established market leaders with big market shares as its financial source, evidence showed NSC did not keep any records of its meetings. Reagan explained this was tragic oversight, but never was a deliberate attempt to cover the tracks of any government illegal operation. Reagan admitted this was one thing that was upsetting to him (that no one kept proper records of meetings or decisions) But America could be assured that at that very moment plenty of recordkeeping was at the current valid in the White House (NNDB 2012).

As suggested by NNDB, “Perhaps so, but that didn’t mean those documents were being produced for lawful inquiries” (NNDB 2012). And NNDB asserts that our Vice President George HW Bush started writing a daily journal in 1986 that encompassed several references to NSC’s operations. Congress later subpoenaed Bush’s documents but he did not mention his diary knowing in detail his diaries were precisely included in the court order. The reasons why Bush wanted to conceal his diary were evident when

portions of the diary were finally revealed by an entry from July 1987 that seemed to explain Bush's restraint to comply with Reagan's order on Iran (NNDB 2012).

NNDB states that it was Howard Baker in the presence of the President claiming George Shultz had kept 700 pages of personal notes once dictated to his staff. That the notes contained personal meetings he had with the President. It was inconceivable not only that he kept such notes, but that he turned all of them over to Congress saying he would of never surrender such documents let alone would he keep such detailed reports (NNDB 2012).

In a more detailed observation of President Reagan's administration, NNDB says that George HW Bush directly attended many of the meetings held by NSC. Even the President had attended a few meetings. But, it was the obvious lack of documentation that allowed Bush and Reagan the entitlement that neither of them had been "in the loop" regarding either the Boland amendment violations or the Iranian scandal to sale or trade arms for hostages. And that was the end to all explanations of any government wrongdoing. NNDB comments that it is pretty amusing the way things like this always seem to work themselves out in government (NNDB 2012).

NNDB says that after George HW Bush became President one of the first things he did was pardon six participants involved in the Iran-Contra scandal facing trial. Bush demanded the prosecutions amounted to nothing more than the criminalization of policy changes (NNDB 2012). It was 15 years later, when his son George W Bush would become President, ordering the National Archives to withhold 68,000 pages of Reagan's administrative documents to including papers that belonged to his father who was

Reagan's VP at the time of the controversy. NNDB proclaims that nobody, not even today knows whether this correspondence included anything relevant to the Iran-Contra scandal and it is likely America will never know (NNDB 2012).

In final, NNDB says, "In all likelihood Ronald Reagan himself genuinely did not remember whether or not he approved the sale of arms to a terrorist nation under intent to illegally fund guerrilla forces in Nicaragua" (NNDB 2012). In the end of his presidency he probably didn't even remember he was ever Governor of California, or even President of the United States for that matter. In November 1994, Reagan announced to the world that he was suffering from Alzheimer's disease that was an incurable and progressive deterioration of his mental faculties were prominent. In August 2002, it was reported that Reagan no longer recognized his own wife Nancy, and according to an unnamed friend of Reagan, "Some days he seems to recognize Nancy as someone familiar, but most of the time she's just a blank to him" (NNDB 2012).

### Belief Systems

Bruce Sabin who has studied Converse says, "The majority of people neither adhere to a full, complete set of beliefs that produce clear principles nor do they have a clear grasp of what their principles are" (Sabin 2011). The measurement of this can be due to the lack of consistency in responses to the questions given by the original individuals ability to ask open-ended questions. Ideologies of elites are not reflected by the masses or voters revolt to a certain political party and do not reflect ideological shifts that are detrimental in many vocations to include education (Sabin 2011).

Nonetheless some political socialites strongly structure their opinions in a larger ideological framework, type or style of structure that is rare. This level of political sophistication or one's level of conceptualization is linked positively with the respondent's level of education, degree of political involvement, and amount of political information. Certainly studies on of various belief systems, to include recent research on political sophistication and heterogeneity, industrialized during deliberations about the analysis and measurement of social belief systems (Sabin 2011).

Sabin tells us that Democratic theories often assume the voters by the masses hold clear ideological values allowing us as a nation to make voting decisions based on the political stance our choice candidate holds concerning both the public and policy issues. There are well-known and frequent divisions of among those who make their evaluation of certain candidates' position on the liberal-conservative ideological spectrum, that same politician can sometimes vary from one end of the spectrum to the other, the assumption is that the electorate then changes his/her position to vote, say like becoming more conservative or more liberal. The lack of voter trust and the communication conveyed by the candidate produces change of electorate preferences (Sabin 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg, the authors of *Socio-Cognitive Heterogeneity in American Public Opinion* claim that belief systems are characterized by their functional interdependence between the attitudes and ideas of people that have been formed by empirical analyses of public opinions and are usually based on simple examples of various independence assumptions by these selective individual attitudes that summarize the belief guide when delivering voter constraint mostly limited to two party political

interdependence measured by their associated coefficients interconnected by nature that identifies this collective set of belief network systems without making any assumptions about how any of the beliefs are relate to one another. It also allows the detection of multiple and competing belief systems, thus providing a test for the hypothesis of political diversity the result relate to the public and their values (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg tell us that while there have been previous studies of political cognition the assumption is that the existence of a single political belief system instead assume in the belief that a multiplicity of ways in which people understand politics use their own inductive analysis to find coexisting political belief systems and assign themselves to these groups without relying on just the candidates' assumption or position concerning how issues or individuals are collective in their political beliefs. The utilitarian payoff though has therefore identified three distinctive ways in which American citizens interpret the political debate that interpret political belief systems (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg declare the most substantive payoff has been the identification of all three characteristics in the way in which American citizens interpret the political arguments "First", both say, "Ideologues organize their political attitudes according to the prevalent liberal-conservative polarity, next alternatives dissociate the publics preferences on moral issues from their economic and civil rights attitudes and lastly, agnostics exhibit weak associations among political beliefs" (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).



Baldassarri and Goldberg begin with the first group ideologues. They confirm to us that ideologues establish the electorate's political attitude and preference according to a considered popularity within liberal-conservatism by its radicalism. Baldassarri and Goldberg say, "These alternatives dissociate with an individuals voting preferences on moral issues by the persons economic and civil rights attitudes and disbelievers demonstrate weak associations among the public and their political beliefs" (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011). "These findings" claim Baldassarri and Goldberg, "are consistent throughout the twenty-year study they did, indeed cast new light on previous beliefs" (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Both say the organization of political beliefs varies fittingly to the level of each individual's political education, sophistication and maturity (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011). Nonetheless, the identification of alternative groups or opinions challenges the assumption. The assumption here is incorrect that there is only one precise method of rationalizing politics. Baldassarri and Goldberg says, "The rationalization of it all is that there is more then just one way to materialize what accounts for political belief systems and can be demonstrated by the current existence of both the candidates' and electorates competing equal and coherent values and by the various ways a person intends to organize his or her preferential political belief system" (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg say their finding strongly support the political heterogeneity approach, and while bringing the facts of social foundations to the forefront it will demonstrate that observed diversity and the publics comprehension of politics do not simply originate from differences in individuals' levels of political interest, information,

or cognitive capabilities (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011). But the answer would be more like people with different sociodemographic profiles may comprehend the political debate analytically in different ways. “Indeed”, says Baldassarri and Goldberg, “many alternatives deviate from the accepted political view and it makes sense effectively accommodating the public otherwise irreconcilable interests and social identities (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg say that the second given category of the prevalence of moral and economic issues in political discourse, and their relationships with religious and class identities, it is difficult for those who are pushed in different ideological directions by their religiosity or economic status to find a comfortable position along the liberal-conservative continuum. “The public’s solution has been to adopt a political worldview that makes room for their seemingly opposing political belief” (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg claim that belief systems that are characterized by alternative beliefs that originate from the political tensions individuals (society) face when assessing the link between their own economic and religious social identity, and both authors declare there are plenty other, potentially contradicting identities that influences the electorates beliefs, but some of these identities have already crystallized into a shared system of beliefs, while others believe differently (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011). And both Baldassarri and Goldberg speculate this has something to do with the growing importance of moral issues in the political discourse in the

U.S., and, moreover, the ambiguous and potentially self-contradictory ideological stance that underlies rhetoric emanating from the Republican Party (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg's results suggest to us that when Americans, who apparently hold competing opinions, they are more likely to privilege their views, which are conventionally seen as conservative, and identify with the Republican Party (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011). Both

Baldassarri and Goldberg explain to us that we believe that political proposals produce an all-important role in the building of one's cognitive framework within which people operate, and over the past four decades both neo-liberal and ultra-conservative advocates have found voice in the Republican Party (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

As per Baldassarri and Goldberg this is because of political commentators, like neo-liberals who support economic deregulation and the ultra-conservative who support moral restrictions might and might appear by chance. "Nonetheless", answers Baldassarri and Goldberg, "These political views or beliefs have found a way to co-exist in the Republican Party, thus making the party more appealing to an ideologically heterodox voter, and contributes to the crystallization of an alternative belief. So, the existence of multiple beliefs system also complicates the relationship between sociodemographic characteristics and voting behavior, agnostically speaking while traditional models of political behavior assume (often implicitly) the following causal pattern despite the public's limited levels of constraint in their political opinion or vote" (Baldassarri,

Goldberg 2011).

Baldassarri and Goldberg's research found that political belief systems revealed that the interaction between religiosity and income gave rise to the public's alternative ways of organizing political preferences. They also found that education affected party identification in the opposite directions for members of the Ideologue and Alternative groups, and that the co-presence of seemingly opposing conservative and liberal preferences were often resolved in favor of the Republican Party. Henceforth in final Baldassarri and Goldberg both say, Moreover, this regression model, which successfully captures the relationship between sociodemographic traits and partisanship, and between issue preferences and partisanship, cannot provide even a hint about how beliefs are organized, and thus cannot help us understand the cognitive framework that people use to make sense of politics in their own lives" (Baldassarri, Goldberg 2011).

### Political Concepts of Evolution

Unrestrained historical political beliefs concerning evolution over the past few decades, amid many other things have compelled a number of political scientists to reconsider a few of their long held beliefs, ideas and rational concepts of this topic. One example noted is "political development," a traditional term that's been associated with the optimistic post WWII scenario in which developing nations were said to be following most industrial societies into the final stages of the post-industrial history, presumably that would end up permanently conserved in a stable democracy by some variant of traditionalism with the balancing of the powers and we not live in fear. That self-satisfied (autonomous) scenario has been squashed by an order of events only suggest that the

modern nation-state may itself may just be a temporary phenomenon, a sort of stepping-stone or stairway to heaven reaching something bigger, smaller, or both. And, this phenomenon perhaps may bring neither. A simple begin to end, for as we know, to live is to die.

Richard Dawkins of The Washington Post “On Faith” Column writes the article, Attention Governor Perry: Evolution is a fact (Dawkins 2011). And, Dawkins wrote this response to Governor Perry for On Faith, the Washington Post’s forum for news and opinion on religion and politics. Dawkins message to the public concerning evolution begins with a close up of Texas governor and GOP candidate Rick Perry. Dawkins says that at a campaign event, Governor Perry once told a boy that evolution was just a theory with gaps, that in Texas both creationism and evolution are taught. Hawkins said Perry then later added God was how we arrived, “But”, says Dawkins, “According to a 2009 Gallup study, only 38 percent of Americans say they believe in evolution so if the majority of Americans are skeptical or unsure about evolution, should schools teach it as a mere theory and why is evolution so threatening to religion” (Dawkins 2011).

In his article Dawkins announces that there is nothing unusual about Governor Rick Perry claiming uneducated fools can be discovered in every country in all periods of history, and they are not unknown in high profile status offices (Dawkins 2011). What Dawkins says is that it is rare about today’s Republican party. Dawkins states, the ridiculous renouncing of the ‘GOP’ nickname. And say why, because the party of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt has lately forfeited and all claims for anything else ought not to be considered grand (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins tells us that in any other political party and in any other country, an individual may occasionally rise to the top in spite of being an uneducated ignoramus, but in today's Republican Party, in spite of this is not the phrase (uneducated ignoramus) that we need. Dawkins expresses that ignorance and the lack of education are positive qualifications, bordering on obligatory administrative and policy matters. Dawkins stands his ground claiming that by having Intellect, knowledge and linguistic mastery it becomes the tool (weapon) mistrusted the most by the Republican voters, who, when choosing a president, apparently seem to prefer someone like themselves over someone actually qualified for the job (Dawkins 2011).

Any other organization claims Dawkins, like a big corporation, say a university, or a learned society, "when seeking a new leader", says Dawkins, "The people will go to immense trouble over the choice comparing the current views of the candidates and their portfolios of applicable experience are precisely observed closely by the electorate. The candidate and their publications are spoken and learned by their committees, references are taken up and scrupulously discussed, and the candidates are subjected to rigorous interviews and selection procedures. Mistakes are nevertheless made, but not through the lack of any grave efforts (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins says that there are more than 300 million people in the U.S. and in this number the inclusion of some of the finest and brightest the human species has to offer, and perhaps even more than in any other country worldwide (Dawkins 2011). But Dawkins also believes that there surely must be something wrong with a system for choosing a leader when, given the collection of such talent, not to mention the engagement of the

one year process that consumes billions of dollars, “What rises to the top of the heap”” says Dawkins, “is George W Bush or the unique possibilities (likes) of Rick Perry, Michele Bachmann or Sarah Palin” (Dawkins 2011).

Back to evolution, theory or fact? In Dawkins opinion, a politician’s attitude towards evolution is perhaps not directly important in itself, but it can have unfortunate consequences on education and science policy but, compared to Perry’s and the Tea Party’s pronouncements on other topics such as economics, taxation, history, politics, sex and etc., but often their display of ignorance concerning evolutionary science is often overlooked (Dawkins 2011). In this case Dawkins says that only with the exception does the politician’s attitude change or sway on their views towards evolution.

However ridiculous it may seem, surprisingly it is nothing more than an approach to a more appropriate test (agree to disagree) of better general inadequacies and various beliefs in evolution. Dawkins states the reasons are due conflicting and dissimilar theories. Dawkins uses the String theory for example where he claims this is the matter of scientific opinion that is genuinely divided about the various ideologies of evolution but uphold no doubt evolution is real (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins declares that evolution is a fact saying that is just as securely established as any other field of science, and stating that anyone who rejects evolution also betrays a sad ignorance and lack of education, by which are most likely to domino affect by extending to other subjects as well (Dawkins 2011). Dawkins says informs us of course that evolution is not some obscure backwoods or basement kind of science. By this, meaning

that encompassing ignorance of which would be pardonable is not acceptable (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins believes evolution is more than an impressive simple, but it is a sophisticated explanation of our very existence and the existence of every living creature on this planet (Dawkins 2011). Dawkins says we should give thanks to Darwin, for now humans have the explanation as to why we are here and why we are the way we are. And, Dawkins sincerely expresses in his tone that humans cannot be ignorant of evolution to be as cultivated and adequate inhabitants that we have revolved into at current (Dawkins 2011).

In this most interesting article written by Dawkins he simplifies the meaning of evolution by verbalizing, “Darwin’s idea is arguably the most powerful ever to occur to a human mind” (Dawkins 2011). As stated by Dawkins, the power of a scientific theory can be measured as a ratio. He says we should consider the number of facts that evolution explains and then divide that by the number of assumptions needed to hypothesize the order for the explanation, that a theory that adopts most of what it is trying to explain is not a good theory and that is exactly why the creationist or so called intelligent design theory is such a terrible theory by example (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins asks the question, “What if any theory of life needs to explain is functional complexity” (Dawkins 2011). And replies, “Complexity can be measured as statistical improbability, and living things are statistically improbable in a very particular direction of functional efficiency” (Dawkins 2011). Dawkins example given is the body of a bird is not just some marvelous complex mechanism that has a trillion cells, for each cell



within itself is a marvel of miniaturized complexities that all conspire and composed to create bones, kidney, a brain and muscle (Dawkins 2011).

Just like humans these connected parts also combine to make it suitable for something in the case of most birds, good for flying, or in humans the capability to hear, see, speak, eat, run or walk. And so would someone say that aeronautic engineers are dumbfounded by their very own admiration for the bird compared to flying machines? Ah this feathered friend that displays flight-surfaces like the flaps (ailerons) similar to that of the wing on a plane. It is the unknown sensitivity of adjustment in real time by the bird, or human and is by the on-board computer, the brain. The breast muscles are the engines and the ligaments; tendons and the all-lightweight bony structures for support are precisely suited for both the landing and taking off. Bird's, humans and planes like evolution are not theory, but are indeed factual (Dawkins 2011).

So then, the entire machine as mentioned above is just a vast improbability of the intellects that, if someone randomly shook the parts up continuously and repeatedly, never in a million years would they fall into the right shape to fly like an owl, soar like an eagle or ride the oceanic up-draughts like a wandering albatross (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins claims that any theory of existence has to clarify how the 'laws of physics' can cause curiosity, even for complex things like a flying bird, a plane, bat or even an extinct flying dinosaur. Then consider a complex swimming machine like a dolphin or a shark, the digging mechanism of a mole, a complex scaling monkey machine, or even a complex thinking machine like a human (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins tells us that Darwin gave an explanation to all of this with a brilliant and simple idea. He says that Darwin called it a natural selection that gradually drives evolution across the immensities of geological time. Personally, like Dawkins says, “Darwin’s theory is a good theory because of the vast ratio explains entire the complexity of life and divides itself by its needs assuming only the nonrandom existence of genetic evidence through the many generations (Dawkins 2011). Dawkins claims that the opposing theory and its explanations of the working complexities of life (creationism), is nearly the worst theory that has ever been proposed. It assumes an intelligent designer (GOD), this is the most complex theory and statistically the theory is more disbelieving than its explanation. In fact, Dawson says this theory of creationism is such a bad theory, merit wise it shouldn’t even be called a theory, nor should it eve certainly doesn’t deserve to be taught together with evolution in science classes (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins confirms that the simplicity of Darwin’s idea is a virtue for three reasons. First, he says, the most important, is evolution maintains its immeasurable power, and when comparing the masses of contrasting facts, evolution explains all that encompass life to include human existence. Secondly, Dawkins states that it is much easier for children to understand, plus its obvious worth of being true. Meaning, it could be taught in elementary school. Finally, claims Dawkins, evolution is extremely beautiful. Dawkins feels as though it is one of most beautiful ideas anyone has come up with and arguably the most powerful theory as well. In final, Dawkins says, “To die in ignorance of its elegance, and power to explain our own existence, would be such a tragic loss, equivalent

of dying without ever having experienced great music, great literature, or a beautiful sunset” (Dawkins 2011).

Dawkins leaves finishes his article with a personal sentiment announcing that there would be many reasons not to vote for Rick Perry. The first Dawkins says is Perry’s fatuous stance on the teachings of evolution in schools maybe isn’t the first reason that enters his mind. But says, maybe, it is the most real litmus test of the many other reasons why. He says that it appears to apply him including others, but unfortunately, to all the likely contenders for the Republican nomination. Dawkins declares the question of evolution certainly no doubt merits a prominent place in the list of questions asked of candidates in all interviews and all public debates and during the course of any election, and what time better than the current (Dawkins 2011).

There is an important substitute to this approach given the direct implications for political evolution and if serving that memory correct, Ah yes, Pol 625-Research Stats with Professor Nishakawa from Ball State University, a wonderful professor indeed best recognized for her teaching philosophies and instruction. This was one of the statistic assignments using a program called SPSS Data. The approach were talking about here was developed by political scientist Robert Axelrod and biologist William Hamilton. The revision of a labyrinthine type game from the famous two-person “Prisoner’s Dilemma” game.

The game incorporated a number of more realistic assumptions that surrounded the nature of the game and the players, and as recollection serves to be correct it was Axelrod and Hamilton who were known for conducting a zealous tournament with their co-workers

they called, “Tit for Tat”. The rules were made to initially work or act together (jointly) for a shared benefit or purpose, then reply to everything the other players did in subsequent rounds. The prisoner’s dilemma game proved unusual, but it was a healthy initiator of co-operative behaviors among its distinctive players. The game not only proved to be a given admission that co-operation (working together) can start even in a world that may also favor defectors (traitors). Secondly, it can thrive in an environment where many other strategies similar are being attempted. Lastly, it can resist invasion by less co-operative strategies.

Some might ask just exactly how does this theoretical framework relate precisely to the evolution of political systems. First we as a nation begin with the recurrent problems and the nature of the definition of politics. In another class with Professor Sally Vasicko also of Ball State University, in her course “The American Judicial System”. One day in class the mentioning of a prominent Chief Justice of the United States who most indiscreetly (undiplomatic like) made a remark during his time on the bench saying that The Constitution was what the judges said it was, basically interpreted as, the Justices were construct or interpret the law as if they were the law. So then, politics is whatever political scientists and political anthro-pologists say it is? Not too mention how significant the pool of many the many definitions of politics are almost equal to that of the number of theorists. The problem is that any given explanation can eliminate or exclude certain types of phenomena, or perhaps one may only worry about one aspect of a multi-faceted class of phenomena.

In Professor John Rouse's class at Ball State University, well, his vital lessons concerning evolution taught us that a Political Scientist by the name of Robert Dahl wrote that the definition of evolution claiming it was the effect of a proposed treaty that governs the use of all terms associated in relation to both evolution and politics. That this treaty advocates the definition of politics like a cloning organism that fully encompasses political and social automations in a cybernetic aspect, or sub-system of any socially organized culture, group or population. That politics in these terms is nothing more than a social process involving efforts to create and acquire control over. Seemingly the automation of control systems, a sub-system of compromising views in the processes of exercising power. The lesson learned was term cybernetics was is not an original one and can be traced to the Greek word *kybernetes* which means a steersman or helmsman, as well as it being the origin of such English words know today; governor and government.

Beyond the particular conditional forecasts, one might ask does this example have any heuristic value due to the implications of using additional expansive, multi-leveled, multi-variant or multi-disciplinary and the given, a closer analysis as to having such a focus on the functional relationships among these two variables (evolution and politics) not merely on the essence of their statistical properties like the collection of evidence of sudden and drastic climate changes and past inductive association with the precipitous decline of many early civilizations forces a more systematic analysis of evolution, the cause of past, present and future political changes

### Interest Groups

Interest groups just like political parties are organizations existent outside the structure of government, but altogether they interact with government in such particular ways it is nearly impossible to separate them. Policymaking is as always linked with both in the effort of making sure government would operate immensely different without them. In recent times a third type of outside organization, and titled political action committees (PACs), have merged with other political parties and interest groups becoming a major influence on policy making in the U.S.

The interest group (organization) encompasses people who enter into political processes in order to achieve their shared goals. Virtually since the beginning, Americans have not put their trust in the motives and methods of influence by these two groups. James Madison once called interest groups and political parties dissenting minorities within the larger group believing the concept of federalism and the separation of powers as necessary only helped to control their evils. And, evermore popular and significant today, and more than any other generation past, the numbers are escalating in these various interest groups and the individuals who participate in them. The learned differences between these groups mentioned include the fact that political parties influence government predominantly through the electoral process. Although serving many purposes, parties always nominate their own candidate pushing to seat them in public office. On the other hand, interest groups and PACs support the candidate, but do not autonomously censure the candidate. Political parties furthermore create and support a broad spectrum of policies. But the interest group supports either one or few related policies. So then, say a political party takes a firm stance on many policies together,

perhaps gun control, business regulations, campaign finance reform or U.S. involvement in conflicts abroad, most all interest groups nearly always focuses on one area instead of the array of policy of position (American Government 2012).

A political action committee (PAC) is the political support of all interest group, and is legally entitled to raise voluntary funds to contribute to favored candidates or political parties. Both, PACS and political parties focus on influencing the election outcome, but their interest in the candidates, a small margin originally based their stance almost always on their affiliation with the particular interest group. Proliferating over the past 25 years, PACS, especially since the Campaign Reform Act of 1974 that limited individual contributions to campaigns it allowed PACs to exist, and the larger interest groups formed PACS as ways to channel money to their favorite candidates to be elected into office. Currently there are more than 4000 PACs that are representing corporations, labor unions, and professional and trade associations, but the biggest outburst has been in the corporate world, with more than half all PAC committees representing corporations or other business interests (American Government 2012).

In closing on the many theories of interest political interest groups whether good or bad for American politics, the many different point of views can be separated into three theories answering the many different doubts or questions asked by the public. Let's begin with the first of the three theories beginning with the Pluralist theory. This theory claims that interest groups benefit American democracy by creating a bond of securing nondiscriminatory and impartial representation to and for all. The benefits of these interest groups provide a link between the people and government. They allow

individuals voices to be heard in ways that otherwise would be lost (American Government 2012).

And, so by having the existence of numerous and various groups means not any single can become too powerful since they are counterbalanced by the other groups, and not one set of groups are able to dominate or reign over the other because where those groups are weak in one resource the resources are stronger in the other groups. These groups typically follow the rules, and those groups not given a bad or corrupt reputation by the public and media or any other source helps to keep the other organizations in line almost instantly. So although business interest groups usually have more money, the other side of the coin reveals labor groups have more members (American Government 2012).

The second is the Elite theory, which argues only a small number of interest groups, possesses most of the power. Although many groups exist, most of them have no real political power and that the government is run by a few big interests trying to preserve their own (autonomous) interests in an addition to an extensive system of interlocking directorates who are the very same people sitting on several boards of many corporations, foundations, and universities that strengthens the political control. The Elitists believe that all corporate interests control a great many government decisions on policy statutes (American Government 2012).

The final group we discuss is the Hyper-pluralist theory that declares there are too many groups at any time none like the current that try to influence the political process, and the results are chaotic within the realms of government and it these interest groups are a mere contradiction amid U.S policy, decision and consequence. Hyper-pluralists argue that our



political system is out of control due to government trying to satisfy every interest within the groups allowing them to dictate (order) policy in their area of interest. Because all interest groups attempt to protect their self-interest (egotism), matters policy only result from such pressure and are basically harmful, sporadic and unorganized conceived by the all imaginary inventions of contemplation by popular political design (American Government 2012).

Seemingly only proper, we close with the mentioning of interest groups with the Watchdog. The Watchdog group is any part of the government or an interest group whose occupation (formal or informal), is to review and make public what other parts of government and groups are doing where there is a necessary to warn the public when something is incorrect. Though some government agencies are precisely created to serve as watchdogs (e.g., public auditors or special governmental investigative committees), in the world of interest groups watchdogs are autonomously self-appointed and for the most part the mass media is regularly viewed by the public as a governmental or corporate watchdog as it investigates and reports, but still the watchdog role is informal and haphazard. Other groups such as the Consumers Union, Judicial Watch, Media Watch, or the Center for Responsive Politics scrutinize parts of the political, economic, or social system and broadcast their findings to the public, often calling for action by the people (American Government 2012).

While every year, thousands of interest groups are created, and each having their own distinct purpose and agenda, the abundance of communication technologies such as the Internet and mobile phones, it is much easier than ever before in history for individuals to

form these varied energetic groups as they communicate amongst one another and act in unison. It is unknown then how civil rights or women's suffrage organizations could have benefited from the information superhighway and I am more than sure that Martin Luther King, Alice Paul and Phyllis Schlafly's Facebook page would of totally "Rocked"!

### Leadership

Can first be explained as the office or position of a leader by one who maintains a capacity to lead. Leadership is the performance or example of leading. In some instances leaders can be found in both public and private administration, and in party leadership from Congress to the President and of the likes of the common man. An ingenuous statement such as a certain politician lacks leadership or what the country needs is to exercise a strong sense of leadership! There are many areas of leadership and the transformation of leadership is the visioning of, the energizing and stimulating changes in leadership processes that unites communities, patrons, and professionals around new models of managerial leadership.

In a short article called Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions from the Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science, the accomplishments of leadership can be translated into visions and strategies the most optimum of organizational performance.

People are the creations that create the organizational climate that value all employees from all backgrounds and walks of life, provide an energizing environment for not only for themselves and the organization, but with the inclusion of the (a) leader's

responsibility to comprehend his or her (autonomous) impact these individuals within the organization helping to improve on all their individual capabilities influential to the capabilities of the many onlookers (Simmons College 2004).

The competencies of leadership define this transformation by its achievement-orientated concern for exceeding the bar for standards of excellence, these standards may be from a person past performance of having strived for improvement and objective measurement that likely result from orientation and outperforming others by being competitive, the setting of challenging goals, or even something one has previously done in the mindset of innovation (Simmons College 2004).

Here we can learn that leadership must encompass a required amount of competency by ways of analytical thinking, problem solving and decision making as they all autonomously combine. A person having the ability to understand an issue, situation or problem within the given intellect scheme of things breaking such matters into smaller pieces by outlining their implications and detailed tutorials that guide the entity by instruction on the how to methods of doing things exhibits great leadership. This includes organizing the parts of every situation that often can seem puzzling. Depending on the issue or problem the leader must make regular and thorough evaluations of any unlike qualities or aspects of the each solutions consequence as he or she applies them by the appropriate methods in exploring the many ways to confront each problem (Simmons College 2004).

A leader must have a community sense of orientation possessing the ability to align one's own organization's priorities with the needs and values of the community including its

cultural and ethnocentric values to move managerial leadership forward, it includes a service orientation to the organizations external and internal customers, as well as its constituencies displaying the utmost competent financial skills possessing abilities to comprehend and clarify fiscal debt and profit. This occurs by maintaining solid bookkeeping records and information. A leader can be even craftier when he or she manages administrative budgets with a firm belief of making sound but long-term investment choices (Simmons College 2004).

Innovative thinking is having the ability to apply complex concepts, develop creative solutions or adapt to previous solutions in new improved ways. When the discovery of information becomes the underlying curiosity and desire to know more about how people or issues, and the desire for administrative knowledge work within the current disciplinary, organizational, and professional trends and developments it allows the leader to better judge the available information sufficient enough to support a decision or action that can help resolve discrepancies with honest discipline. The asking of a series of questions; and scanning for potential opportunities or information can be helpful to the organizations future by staying current and seeking the best practices for the implementation thereof (Simmons College 2004).

Leadership must display an array, a broad spectrum a strategic orientation to consider the business, demographic, and ethno-cultural items of concern. These factor in the political and regulatory implications of decisions helping to develop strategies that constantly advance the long-term success and viability of the organization. It also includes assessing risk and regularly taking educated risks where appropriate. These types or attributes of

leadership have an achieved set of communication skills that allow the leader to communicate and author in an intelligent but clear, and grammatical logic manner, both in formal and informal situations. The role of such leadership dictates the preparedness of cogent business presentations able to facilitate assembly of the masses and the ability to persuade, convince, influence, or impress others (individuals or groups) in that order by charismatic influence or by the support another cohort's opinion or position (Simmons College 2004).

We learn that leadership involves organizational awareness, which is the ability to comprehend and expand our knowledge of the power relationships in one's own organization or in other organizations like stakeholders, suppliers and others. A leader must possess the ability to identify the real decision makers within levels of authority within any administration. The leader tends to be the one individual who can influence the others with the ability to predict how new events or situations that arise will affect the individuals and groups within the organization, both internal and external (Simmons College 2004).

Leadership also comes with accountability. To hold people accountable to values of performance and ensure compliance using the power of one's position or force of personality appropriately and effectively, with the long-term good of the organization in mind it must involve people in the development of the organizations standards that impact their performance measurement and a necessary change in leadership if necessary to energize participants sustaining commitment to the changes in the many ways the leaders approaches, processes and strategizes the collaboration in working cooperatively

with others having the goal and motto that leadership it to be part of a team, to work together, as opposed to working separately or competitively. Collaboration applies when a person is a member of a group of people functioning as a team, but not solely as the leader (Simmons College 2004).

Leadership includes proper knowledge and use of information technology management systems and envisions the organizations potential by understanding and using administrative information tools, including active sponsorship of organizational technology within its system and the continuous upgrading information for possible management capabilities. All in all, leadership encompasses the initiative to make decisions and solve problems proactively taking opportune action in light of its identification to address current or future problems and or opportunities. In this context, initiative also includes the ability to involve staff or other participants in the decision-making and problem solving processes ensuring a greater demand of cooperation and accountability among those implementing or affected by the decisions and solutions, otherwise known as consequences to the ever reoccurring administrative and leadership duty (Simmons College 2004).

The performance measurement of any leadership should use statistical and financial methods and metrics for the setting of goals to measure organizational performance; commitment to and employment of evidence-based techniques. This also includes a measurement of customer expectations satisfaction and quality of services rendered to the public. This is where leadership must establish proper techniques in project management, then plan and execute these projects with the significant possibilities without impacting

team management. Some projects may possibly include the construction of a major building or the development of a new service (Simmons College 2004).

People in leadership roles must exhibit professionalism by demonstrating a solid commitment to ethics, all-encompassing professional practices, social accountability, and by genuine community stewardship. The desire to autonomously act in a way that is consistent with one's values and what one says is important can provide a much better sense of team leadership for oneself as a leader of others when forming a team that possesses balanced capabilities to its organizational setting (i.e. its mission, values and norms) as well as to holding all members regardless of status accountable individually and as a group for better results, socialization, and professional development. To do this a cross-cultural compassion and the ability to interact effectively well with diverse personality types (Simmons College 2004).

Human Resources Management is a required must in the role of any leadership. Having the ability to implement various employment practices that comply with the legal and regulatory characteristics and requirements, and to represent contemporary approaches to human resources policies can build and establish adequate and solid relationships and sustain professional contacts for the purpose of building networks of people with similar goals that support similar interests (Simmons College 2004).

And in final leadership encompass both self-confidence and personal development with the belief within individual's own capabilities to accomplish tasks or select other choice, but effective approaches to a new task or problem. This includes confidence in one's ability as expressed in increasingly challenging circumstances and confidence in every

individual's decisions or opinions demonstrating emotional intelligence with the regards to one's self and others having an accurate view of one's own strengths and development needs, including the impact or influence one has on others. In final leadership is the willingness to engage in regular self-assessments while regulating these needs through an expected self-directed learning and the trying of new approaches while either failing or succeeding at all cost in becoming a leader (Simmons College 2004)

## **V. Conclusion:**

A set organizational structure may not agree with all the evidence when progressing in the proper operational engagement. Such deviation reduces performance when on the increase. An example would be that the wrong organizational structure may hinder cooperation and therefore the completion of instruction and information might be nothing more than construed phases within the organizations restraining available resources in addition to their budgets. Such organizational structures might adaptively incline to such process requirements aiming to function properly by the percentage of effort and input in comparison to that of its output.

In other words, an effective organizational structure would smooth out the progress of working relationships between numerous entities within its organization improving the working conditions to include efficiency within all organizational components. Thus organizations should preserve a set of orders and forms or types of control promoting competent supervision in the many administrative processes. Organizations must support commands for coping with a mix of instructions or any change of conditions while performing its vocation and should allow for the purpose of advancing individual skills to



enable highly proficient flexibility in its functions of creativity with the acceptance of failure for no entity is made to perfection.

When any organization expands the chain of command it will only then lengthen the span of its control by expansion. When an organization starts to mature, the suppleness will decrease and the creativity will become weak with fatigue, therefore organizational structures should and must be altered from time to time to facilitate revitalization. If such alterations are prevented internally, the final escape is to change downhill direction of the organization and prepare to a re-embark on an entirely new arrangement, something of a fail to succeed as was in history as is the current state of policymaking governments.

An old saying holds true to those who cannot remember the past, they are more than condemned to repeat it. Unfortunately, government and the presidency seem to think the history of the workings of politics began the day they first took office and were sworn in. For this very reason, each emerging political movement in and by administration tends to be viewed completely as something relatively new, without any historical context whatsoever. Such is largely the case today with the presidency, government and all modern cultures of administration, thereof in and by what used to be thought of as old, but is indeed a newly revised government.

To better acknowledge a comprehension of America's modern debate over government, from Congress, to the presidency and by his administration, the study to their history is paralleled to more outrageous claims made by some of the proponents of the Constitution and cautions against forgetting the important lessons of the past. It shows us that the invitations by many for a change the way the government operates have been the constant

theme from the very establishment of the framers and their political philosophy. Only admonishing another absolute reminder to us that at the current our problems today, while serious, are nothing really anything new.

A positive relationship between the government and the people they serve, fostered by confidence and beliefs are essential to all entities of government. Government is accountable with vigorous enforcement of the law; they must meticulously observe the rights of all people. Society at the same time also must be free to take action in a reasonable, lawful, and impartial manner without fear of reprisal as is written in the Constitution of the United States.

It is important, therefore, that adequate provisions be made for the prompt receipt, investigation and disposition of complaints regarding the conduct of Government personnel, to the end of undisclosed decision making machines welcoming criticism of the Department and validating complaints against its members or procedures of policy having the mission and vision to increase public awareness, safety and improvements in fair administration of government across America. Through innovative leadership by all platforms, government must provide and coordinate all information, research and development, offering its most accurate and honest statistics when giving beneficial support to the people and their communities this organization maintains a competent community partner style management that meet public goals.

I have to agree with Alice Paul In her remarks when she presented the Equal Rights Amendment in Seneca Falls in 1923. Alice Paul sounded the call of great poignancy and significance in the ERA and 80 years later, to keep on this way as we will be celebrating

the 164th anniversary of that very 1848 Convention, still its remnants abide without much further advancement in equal rights at the current. If not for Alice and others who encouraged a concentration on the Federal Amendment the nation today would have encompassed prejudice towards a female working class without suffrage. Just as Alice Paul envisioned, individuals in society will not be safe until the standards of equal rights is transcribed into our government's framework and respected.

It is true that a pattern of shared and basic assumptions cultured within any organization may or may not solve its problems of various external adaptations and internal integrations, but to do so demonstrates its possibilities of achieving great leadership proving again the organizations desire in its course to succeed. But for any organization to thrive successfully internally or externally leadership in the labor of its personnel to the latter must prove people will be treated consistently in terms of those assured rudimentary expectations, and eventually autonomously behaving according to those assumptions in order to make the world a stable and predictable place.

Evolution is working to squash patronage in its tracks. The people's power to appoint or elect to office, position or rank are individuals who propose promises of change in the best interest of its electorates. But these providers and receivers of patronage claim to form a government network where its people are able to access the many various resources from them while being appointed into office and other important positions alike. It is though within these exact organizations they reveal themselves, the most prestige positions obtainable with negligence after being sworn in. This behavior

originates from an unequal distribution of power since ancient times and as always has been closely linked with organizational corruption that must stop.

I don't believe anyone other than Shakespeare said it better than back in a 16th century play I attended at the University of Texas back in 1992. As the actor reiterated those famous words by Shakespeare, "Some are born great and some achieve greatness, but some have greatness thrust upon them" (Actor for Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, 1623). Still today those words echo in my mind having a sense of awe. Shakespeare treasured using devices of mistaken identities proving the realities of social theory and used this conventional method more competently than most without notoriety to the particulars of organization or towards any governance in violation of administration.

The most important goals towards human capital management is to generate a performance aligned workforce by implementing competence in active HCM systems, policies, procedures, and practices that are determined fair and equitable for all with no division. It requires constant monitoring of the organizations allies with maintaining it competent agency strategic mission and vision both internally and externally consistent (reliable) and integrated (incorporated).

In General, power within an organization such as in "patronage" has an ability to cause or prevent administration actions encouraging effective change. The discretion is to act or not act and is the opposite of disability in the establishment of power. Both can differ from the right consequence that has no accompanying duties, but only to appoint, confirm and possibly involve corruption. Merit based systems with the characteristics of Human

Capital Management (HCM) seems to be the most accurate and appropriate avenue organizations must heed and conformed to the maintenance of good qualified employees for directorial success, enhancing public support.

Both government and the presidency should make every attempt to ensure that government administrative organizations reflect the diversity of their communities served. They must measure their organization to promote equality of opportunity and equality of service delivery to society as an undivided nation whole, not just to the community they serve within their entity.

Organizational policies should maintain the foundation whereby its structures and processes completely ensure full circle legal, political and community accountability. The introduction of civilian oversight should automatically be measured by any robust mechanisms to the handling of genuine complaints toward government. Complaints should be free from discriminatory factors within and outside the department in order to maintain absolute success in the possibility of development and the discrimination against ethnic minorities. By introducing solid and sound camaraderie with the use of innovation in a continuous proficient and efficient policy making manner society can economically flourish.

Social scientists continually dispute as to whether evolutionary human, structural and technical changes or attitudinal changes essentially transpired first in order to bring about organizational social change. A justification must be able to be made so that both should occur in relation to one another, before gender or general public egalitarianism will be achieved. This is as true in many organizations as is it for government, and in other

aspects of our social and occupational lives. Yet, it is clear that the structural changes in law in the United States and by Amendments to the established Constitution have helped to do nothing more than create an increase our national debt, establishing and maintaining uneducated individuals and thrusting individuals into poverty.

An area that should warrant for the most part should acquire some sort of concentration into our American budget preparation. Budget managers should not feel inadequate or left out in deciding expenditures or profits within their organization's budget. The belief is, most if not all are never consulted to whether or not adequate amounts of resources are enough made readily available by its continual consumption to and by the public. The bottom line is, when it comes to successful business budgeting and forecasting in any entity, it might depend on the organizations ability to find, comprehend and manufacture a broad variety of information from many different sources. The finest corporate budgeting tools like software or even the use of experts are useless without a current understanding of the business, its budget and the business' future forecast. A ledger must not be kept secret to the organization or the public it serves.

For any organization to succeed in its goal or by its mission, motivation with a misunderstanding may superficially at first encounter-intuitive imaginations like the environment of an office with a country club type atmosphere, a monetary lifestyle where social and self-satisfaction takes lead over priorities, real tasks, duties or responsibilities. While people of all walks of life may respond enthusiastically and cheerfully to their environment, the possibility is, they not are particularly productive at all autonomously by the divided incoherency of evolutionary charismatic influence.

In the face of continued organizational corruption and scandals, most government and presidency administrators have been inclined to preserve (almost) a fearful preoccupation with the possibilities confronted by accountability and conformity. But according to others in politics such control oriented approaches fail to recognize government as always continues discretion in its language. The basic paradox of government and its hierarchy write that its discretionary authority tends to be greater at the lower level of the governments organization, whereby government applies the laws, policy and regulations to the abundant situations that do not fit neatly in the rulebooks. Furthermore discretionary choices like previously mentioned are now becoming far more removed from the direct scrutiny of executives and administrators alone with the help of the media not so intimidated as the past and the general public in terms of the coming of age media through Internet resources.

Ah, the good ole' Internet highway, only advanced, like administration spoke of. What a great tool by method to school and educate the public in a broader historical and current cultural context relevant and considered essential rather than the attempt to just simply define such autonomous principles of government previously learned. One of the worst mistakes people make is associating learning almost entirely with that of formal instruction only. By refining our thinking and becoming educated on the policies and consequences thereafter these principles of government and the presidency may adequately validate what we as a nation have been doing these last few centuries.

Acknowledged by many, human behavior is one of the most complex phenomenon's known to mankind. Human personality, behavior and motivation are all very complex

processes with an abundance of diversities given their theoretical perspectives and interpretations that make ever attempt to define each other. Nonetheless, these definitions often overlap by having no specific completion by their individual processes. Human motivation similarly moves in the same pattern.

Motivational presumption tries to approach the responsible mechanisms for pushing humans in a certain direction, typically in the direction towards some need, want, interest or desire. It could be in other terms, motivation only encompasses goal directed behavior. While there are many different theories that try to explain human motivation, most of the theories might just be grouped into two categories. The first category falls under theories that primarily explain motivation as a mechanism of natural born and biological forces. The second group could encompass theories that support more heavily on a learned sense of social explanation for human motivation that overlap simple explanations to begin with.

It is obvious Maslow was correct when he claimed that humans were unique because of their great capacity for individual growth, in other words we all have the ability to evolve towards a higher state of self-being. Maslow classified these lower level needs as human deficiency, they are needs of being without when we feel that something is lacking in our lives, the act that drives our inner being. However he also classified our upper-level needs being growth. These needs happen because they cannot be explained by our driven incentive or ideas.

The need and desire for having the knowledge to understand self-actualization are all examples of growth needs. Self-actualization is the highest need listed in Maslow's



hierarchy theorizing if people are unable to achieve their fullest potential, though a difficult concept to measure and study, if not discovered most of the population would be profoundly filled by motivational ways only similar to that of others incurring no change.

There is no doubt that every organization needs an array of budget or financial methods that model self-actualization for the organization. By exercising technology and other competent strategies like motivation, which is human nature, one must want the need to desire success. Productivity is usually accompanied by rewards and depending on the rewards, they can make a difference in administrative productivity. Obviously proven time and time again, to have an organization without regulations or administrative law more corruption would incur in business transactions making it difficult for organizations to fully grow to their fullest potential.

The enforcement of government and the preservation of liberty are substantial to life's existence among all citizens. It's a necessity to protect every individual's equality. That is what our country claims to be, a free society. But, currently and so far in many circumstances throughout history to the current, there are at times an abuse of power that our national government either has taken from or denied to us doing something without the right to do so. From the emaciated air over the past century government stands by the claim it will carry out nobility for the citizens, that the newly acquired powers would be strictly controlled, and never will be used to dominate the people or tread on our Constitution. The promise that seems confused by the varied and temporal change with each new government.

Since this vicious repetitive cycle has begun the method is concurrent still with promises of government, but the powers were never actually given back. Every time this has entered into the minds of our central government its growth has become more superior by its capacity. They tell us not to trust ourselves, to put our faith in them for they are flawless and perfect people with the given authority and power to make necessary change for the good of mankind.

And as they try to convince the people of this, in a sense that they are more capable of planning everyone's life by the instance of failing distance capitols obscured from the front door or our homes, to our communities, and all of America, as we know it. These promises usually are never made good but only on the surface. They turn into lies once in office. On the contrary, politics are a dog eat dog world gone wild. A true reality program unlike those viewed on television so popular today.

Administrative status, whether president, senator, mayor, judge, professor, movie star, singer or ordinary civilian should be accountable in the adjudication of the crime subsequent to the punishment for offense. The example like rape, some laws are universal and non-arbitrary, so no one's status should have nothing to do with the adjudication and punishment for the crime, nor show favorability. The precise meaning to "rule of law" and every man or woman, whatever be his/her condition, position, rank or status should be subject to the ordinary law of the Constitutional realm, to its fullest extent in agreement to face jurisdiction by an ordinary court of justice and body appointed to make such judgment or inquiry, and should include all processes of legalities contained in America's legal tribunals.

All law in the factual sense consists of a set of general rules (beliefs and norms) that apply to all people, as opposed to the laws that are simply ordered by legislature requiring particular people to do specific things, such as the presidency and government.

Constitutional rule of law is critical to the preservation of liberty. Unfortunately, most Americans neither recognize, comprehend nor appreciate this, notice, we are a nation that has been and are increasingly being ruled by arbitrary orders and privileges based upon one's charismatic and all powerful status.

The current trend of poverty by the devaluation in our economic value is not just repeating itself it is furthering our national debt. Many companies like the savings and loan banks that incurred huge losses because of their duplicitous deceptive motives lacked autonomous common sense and made very foolish investments. But, Congress bailed them out again, just like back in 1987 when the stock market crashed, many Americans incurred hefty losses because of unwise, perhaps stupid, investments by these organizations. If equal treatment before the law was established as intended by the Constitution it would require that if Congress bails out one American, by individual, group or other that make unwise or stupid investments, then our government should bail out any American who does the same. Instead, as we all watched, Congress furnished particular people privileges because of their status.

The fact that Americans have become ruled by orders and special privileges helps to explain all the money grafted and divided in view of government policy. We've become absent from a government with limited powers, as our Founders envisioned, to one with overwhelming powers. Therefore, it pays people to disburse huge amounts of money in

order to influence Congress and side in their favor. In a sense, a contract with Congress granting special privileges that is denied to other Americans.

Well, not sure at times if the ole' saying that Congress will not force or pass no laws that do not apply equally to all Americans at the current even stands to deliver. Indeed and undoubtedly music to many ears and quite the suggestion for complete autonomy and equality, that is before the law was both made straightforward and philosophical, when once upon time it seemed to do limitless marvels in developing the liberties envisioned by our Founders. But I'm gambling on the thought that most Americans would welcome this ideology with disdain after they realized that it would denote Congress making it nearly impossible to allow the enactment of orders that play favoritism with different Americans because of the status quo, whatever be his or her condition, position, rank or status be.

One concept found to be of administrative importance was how Roosevelt threw himself into national leadership with the ambitious drive of vengeance. Most do respect him for his devoted self-determination and autonomous behavior in his endeavor and process towards the progressive movement and pursuing "liberal nationalism", what a crusader indeed, as was the charismatic Ronald Reagan.

President Roosevelt simply exercised important legislative functions by issuing this executive order long ago to maintain the force of law and by authorizing administrative agencies to promulgate by the same rules in conformity of the law. Certainly though, it isn't shocking, that so many of the Supreme Court's most recent decisions on federalism certainly replicate the same vernacular as a basis for judicial invalidation of federal laws.

Meaning, the Rehnquist Court's federalism related decisions have limited, not enhanced such personal freedom. Broadly defined, federalism clearly increases liberty. The power of state courts to provide more protection of rights under state constitutions than exists under the U.S. Constitution is an example of how federalism enhances personal rights. However, the Rehnquist Court interpretation of federalism has been the concern of limiting federal power, not as regards of empowering the states. The assumption could be that restricting the power of the federal government essentially weakens the chances of any totalitarian action.

To err is human as human is to prosper in accordance with laws of nature, god and man. And government as is the presidency; yes they too are very humanistic entities by far. But under great scrutiny in a location that forces much accountability and responsibility upon those who are intelligent enough to be appointed and elected and to read on the line or in between the lines of constant, but true interpretation of our Constitution. This is exactly what, why and where they are in reality. It is what it is, and it is a great formula of existence between qualified and quantified governments currently and if by chance, some traditional format or infinite pattern sourced to be in the best interest of society as society is currently changing, as do the interpretation of our laws written constitutionally, realizing evolution within society is an apparent apparatus often denied.

Who could blame a president wanting the best administration and the highest court in the land having his same ideas or views in common? So far all presidents by opinion, have made their favored nominated preference in the past and recent by the presence of their followers and have succeeded in doing so by the use of the moral comprehension the old,

but new threshold merit system. With the concern of our dreadful and diminishing economy in the United States by the use of a simple comparison to that of generations past, again one day our country may recover economic value again.

But, Of course more than predominately understood it was only generations ago we were not feeling such “crunch time” per say in such economic crisis as at current. In today’s trying times with the loss of the nations jobs, income, homes and the increase of Medicaid recipients, there should be a given confirmation to the people of the U.S. that the union between our government and the president is working very diligently to overcome, persevere and to triumphantly pull out of the current national recession. And, currently our Congress sometimes successfully unite with the president on such legislation as to limit property taxes, cut government spending, avoid tax hikes, stimulate our states job growth, modernize government while at the same time continue to contend by putting an end to “malevolence” with stricter enforcements only introduces better methods or a course of action by redistricting and enhancing already popular government ethics.

The message here produces great response and approval with constituents who have strongly supported the joint effort to cap, cut, combine and conserve any financial plans proposed on expenditures and estimated revenues for the future of our nation. The nations economic benefits are definitely beyond a need to increase proportionately to those benefits by their extended efforts honorably and without corruption in the policy making process by opinion. And, that these failures of recession come from poorer quality decision making methods when adjusting to their individual budgets and spending

deficits causing an excess of expenditure over revenue only generating growth in the American deficit.

Most budgets are accounted for annually and are prepared as a working operational plan that, upon approval, becomes a legal working document of any administration. This process is critical providing standards against which actual performances can be measured. The focus of the organization should assess current to future operations reassessing its organizational goals and objectives with the means for accomplishing them. Administration must maintain the ability to coordinate the overall operation of the organization while facilitating communication throughout assisting leaders to recognizing when change is needed.

Organizations have operation manuals with very complex rules, procedures and regulations (e.g. The U.S. Constitution) that are designed to show members what to do in certain situations they encounter. These same administrative departments must govern an acceptable amount of discipline standards that are similar to, but less stringent than the even the military. Any violations of department standards or conduct should lead to the sanctioning of all political officials for dismissal from the administration during or after any evidence of has been revealed. Managing problem employees is a common problem today as in the past in all occupations.

Trying to identify and manage problematic employees can be a difficult task if not avoided or swept under the rug due to status purpose. But by doing so, however should be a crucial objective of any organization in for the handling of vital matters efficient, objective and fair in discipline for all involved.

Just a reminder, workforces like these can have a negative impact on any administrative organization not only on the inside of the department, but that outside of the department as well. Not just with the presidency or other forms of government, but by all entities. By following a logic pattern effective in identifying these individuals, in turn it will help improve genuine ethical performance by each employee under this influence instead. Another important managerial aspect in administration is the proper delegation of its authority and power. Its tasks, duties and responsibilities should and need be delegated or assigned to those subordinates who are trustworthy in using a given authority and power. The individual elected must properly control or command by making precise decisions that truly act in the group's best interest and social order in order to complete all viable tasks within the organization.

In final observation of this case study, the revelation is, that for many years, the corporate world gives way to the impression of moving toward more self-governing (autonomous) process of method by which the approach in the areas of shared leaderships and participative management models in the workplace chose to make many efforts as they try to improve competitiveness by discovering experience, knowledge, talents, and wondrous creative abilities within their organization. By using these methods of participative management, organizations have shown greater improvements in terms of productivity, quality and worker satisfaction.

However, these power-sharing methods have established very little acceptance in governmental organizations. And, at a time, when all along government has been emphasizing proactive, community-oriented approaches by the public to the value of



comprehending political topic. In the transformation of these skills, it would initiate the provisions of public empowerment alongside a shared leadership may also offer significant advantages over traditional top to bottom administrative subordinate relationships.

So, in the end, was Ronald Reagan's presence merely that of his Hollywood character (personality)? Just an actor who simply played in his roll of presidency, like making the part in his Hollywood films he once auditioned and appeared in? He had not an ounce of political experience, but a man who simply possessed charismatic (alluring) behavior both as governor and president like the actor he portrayed in his movies. Did Nancy really make the political calls with the assistance of her psychic? Why did the media ignore such clown type presidency? Who really was in charge and why is America in so much debt? Was (is) there financial scandal? You have the facts now so you must autonomously decide what was right or wrong with the decisions made by the charismatic political machine Ronald Reagan.

By analyzing many of the new technological developments, to include the Internet, which is integrated with traditional concepts that are already being used in organizational theory and technical complexity by way of individual or group task and task interdependence implicitly affects organizational design by the population of citizens, society in general on both the public and private organizations outlook. Fact, like our Founding Fathers, a natural balanced theory added to institutional theory will make for a successful organization in the near future.

My personal reaction like many other American's who are served by these well known and most recognized public elected officials, we the people would like to have faith envisioning one day there will be no division and that such employees would try to not be encouraged into taking sides in any elections, either by incumbents or their challengers. A wise public servant remains objective, refusing to cater to these absurd political whims of government unless they want to see their careers tossed aside as those politics change. Whether most believe it or not our world as we know is changing faster than lightening, quickly burning around us right before our very eyes and we cannot reverse, change or stop it. Those famous words of Life, Liberty, Justice and the pursuit of happiness, the words that are forever engraved in the soul of America it is a must to consider our innate peace and abundance to prosper as a society.

## **VI. References:**

American Politics. (2012). *Participation, Interest Groups, and Lobbying Glossary* Retrieved April 1, 2012 from [www.laits.utexas.edu/gov310/PIG/index.html](http://www.laits.utexas.edu/gov310/PIG/index.html)

Baldassarri Delia, Goldberg. (2011). *Amir Socio-Cognitive Heterogeneity in American Public* Retrieved March 30, 2012 from [http://www.princeton.edu/~dbalda/papers/BaldassarriGoldberg\\_BeliefNetworks\\_2010.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~dbalda/papers/BaldassarriGoldberg_BeliefNetworks_2010.pdf)

Beschloss, Michael and Sidey, Hugh. (2012). *The Presidents of the United States of America* " WhiteHouse.gov-Copyright 2009 by the White House Historical Association.

Dawkins Richard. (2011). *The Washington Post On Faith Attention Governor Perry: Evolution is a fact* Retrieved March 31, 2012 from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/on-faith/post/attention-governor-perry-evolution-is-a-fact/2011/08/23/gIQAuIFUYJblog.html>

Encyclopedia. Com. (2012). *Reaganomics* American Decades | 2001 | COPYRIGHT 2001 The Gale Group, Inc. Retrieved on March 1, 2012 from <http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Reaganomics.aspx>

Francis Roberta W. (2012). Chair of the ERA Task Force National Council of Women's Organizations. *The History Behind the Equal Rights Amendment* Retrieved April 17, 2012 from [equalrightsamendment.org/era.htm](http://equalrightsamendment.org/era.htm)

National Security Archive. (2012). Retrieved on February 15, 2012 from <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/foia.html>

Ronald Reagan Facts - *Ronald Reagan Presidential Library* (2012) Retrieved on January 31, 2012 from <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/reference/facts.html>

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. (2012). *National Archives and Records Administration* Retrieved on February 14, 2012 from <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/>

Rosenberg, Jen. (2012). 20<sup>th</sup> Century History-Ronald Reagan Retrieved February 26, 2012 from <http://history1900s.about.com/od/ronaldreagan/p/reagan.htm>

Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science. (2004). *Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions* Retrieved April 1, 2012 from [http://web.simmons.edu/~phdml/docs/phdmlip\\_models.pdf](http://web.simmons.edu/~phdml/docs/phdmlip_models.pdf)

Taratoot Cole D. and Nixon David C. (2011). With Strings Attached: Statutory Delegations of Authority to the Executive Branch. Retrieved on July 29, 2011 from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02395.x/full>

NNDB. (2012). Tracking the Entire World *Ronald Reagan-The Rotten Library Pages* Retrieved on March 30, 2012 from <http://www.nndb.com/people/359/000022293/>

Sabin Bruce M. (2012). The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics Retrieved March 30, 2012 from [http://www.princeton.edu/~dbalda/papers/BaldassarriGoldberg\\_Belief\\_Networks\\_2010.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~dbalda/papers/BaldassarriGoldberg_Belief_Networks_2010.pdf)

Shakespeare William. (1623). *Twelfth Night the play by William Shakespeare* Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://www.william-shakespeare.info/shakespeare-play-twelfth-night.htm>

Urban Affairs Center. (1985-1989). UAC Reports - *A Federal Policy Impact Study* Retrieved March 28, 2012 from <http://uac.utoledo.edu/Publications/uac-reports-85-89.htm>

University of Virginia, Miller Center. (2012). *American President A Reference Source: Ronald Wilson Reagan: Domestic Affairs* Copyright 2012 Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia Retrieved February 27, 2012 from <http://millercenter.org/president/reagan/essays/biography/4>

### **Endnotes:**

- [1] Rawls, John. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Revised edition (1999) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [2] Kymlicka, Will. (1989). *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- [3] Hirschmann, Nancy. (2002). *The Subject of Freedom: Toward A Feminist Theory of Freedom*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

### **Sources:**

The Presidential library administered by the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), and the Reagan Library, under the authority of the Presidential Records Act, is the repositories of presidential records for President Reagan's administration (University of Texas, 2012). The University of Texas holdings include 50 million pages of presidential documents, over 1.6 million photographs, a half million feet of motion picture film and tens of thousands of audio and videotapes (University of Texas, 2012). In addition this library houses personal papers collections including documents from Reagan's eight years as Governor of California (University of Texas, 2012). Information on accessing all of these records, including how to file a Freedom of Information Act request, can also be found in the University's research section (University of Texas, 2012).

The U.S. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is a law that guarantees public access to the United States and its record of government. FOIA believes in the disclosure, for government carries the burden, not the public for evidence and why information may not be released. Upon written request, agencies of the United States government are required to disclose those records, unless they can be lawfully denied from disclosure under one of nine specific exemptions in the FOIA. This is a right that has been given to all people of free access and is ultimately enforceable in federal court (National Security Archive, 2012).

